

JPRS-UPS-84-094

26 October 1984

USSR Report

POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS



FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

26 October 1984

USSR REPORT
POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

CONTENTS

INTERNATIONAL

Table of Contents of RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR, No 4, 1984 (RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR, No 4, Jul-Aug 84).....	1
Information on Authors (RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR, No 4, Jul-Aug 84).....	3
Zagladin on Marxism-Leninism, International Working Class Role (V. V. Zagladin; RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR, No 4, Jul-Aug 84).....	4
Women in the Antiwar Movement of the Eighties (Ye. P. Blinova; RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR, No 4, Jul-Aug 84).....	34
Various Forms of Economic Centralism in CEMA (O. R. Latsis; RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR, No 4, Jul-Aug 84).....	41
Chilean Working Class Activities Examined (I. Ye. Rybalkin; RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR, No 4, Jul-Aug 84).....	49
Brazilian Economic 'Structural Crises' Examined (A. P. Karavayev; RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR, No 4, Jul-Aug 84).....	62
Institute Discussion of Western Economic Crisis (A.-V. Karlsen, V. K. Kolomiyets; RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVRE- MENNY MIR, No 4, Jul-Aug 84).....	68

International Trade Union Conference on Antiwar Movement
(B. G. Stolpovskiy; RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYI MIR,
No 4, Jul-Aug 84)..... 81

Institute Book on Adverse Effects of New Technology in West
(R. M. Entov; RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYI MIR, No 4,
Jul-Aug 84)..... 88

INTERNATIONAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR, NO 4, 1984

Moscow RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR in Russian No 4, Jul-Aug 84 (signed to press 13 Jul 84) p 191

[Text] CONTENTS

Gus Hall, "Halt the Reagan Course for Nuclear Confrontation".....	3
V.V. Zagladin, "Marxism-Leninism on the Role of the Working Class in International Relations".....	15
A.I. Bel'chuk, "The 70's and Early 80's in the Economic Development of Capitalism".....	40
FOR THE HUMAN RIGHT TO LIFE	
Ye.P. Blinova, "Women in Antiwar Movement in 80's".....	55
IN SOCIALIST COUNTRIES	
O.R. Latsis, "Economic Centralization and Centralism of Management: Problems of Concordance".....	61
THE WORKING PEOPLE IN DEVELOPED CAPITALIST COUNTRIES: CONDITION AND STRUGGLE	
L.Ya. Mashezerskaya, "The USA: Crisis of Industrial Democracy and the Attitude of the Labour Movement".....	70
THE WORKING PEOPLE IN ASIAN, AFRICAN AND LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES	
M.I. Braginskiy, "Social Structure of African Liberated Countries (70's and 80's)".....	79
I.Ye. Rybalkin, "The Chilean Working Class in the Vanguard of the Struggle Against the Fascist Dictatorship".....	87
A.P. Karavayev, "Aggravation of Structural Crisis and the Working People's Condition in Brazil".....	96
PAGES OF HISTORY	
A.K. Sokolov and Ye.G. Suntsova, "Workers Delegates at the 1st Congress of Soviets of the USSR".....	112
M.I. Semiryaga, "To the 40th Anniversary Since the Start of the Liberatory March of the Soviet Army".....	120
NOTES AND ESSAYS	
Ya.Ya. Kotkovskiy, A.N. Zhamaletdinova and L.F. Yukhnina, "The Arms Race and Some Aspects of the Activity of War Industry Companies".....	128

Ye.D. Stroganova, "Working People's Struggle Against TNC's in Manufacturing Industry in Latin America".....	142
---	-----

CONFERENCES AND DISCUSSIONS

A.-V. Karlsen and V.K. Kolomiyets, "The Present Stage of Crisis Development of Capitalism and the Struggle of the Proletariat".....	150
B.G. Stolpovskiy, "Time to Act--for Peace, for Social Progress".....	157
T.V. Pavlova, I.L., "Italian Scholars Received at the Institute of International Labor Movement".....	161

REVIEW OF BOOKS

V.Ye. Petrovskiy, "Dialectics of the Struggle for Democracy and Social Progress".....	164
A.M. Katsva, "The Road of Creativity and Fraternal Cooperation".....	167
V.A. Brun-Tzekhovoy, "The Working Class in the Focus of Research (On the Activities of the Institute of Marxist Studies, FRG)".....	169
R.M. Entov, "Modern Capitalism: Technology and Employment".....	175
K.G. Kholodkovskiy, "Strike Movement in Italy (Substance, Results, Problems)".....	178
N.M. Zotov, "The Last Book by Ruth First".....	180
V.I. Maslov, "Production Management--Object of Class Struggle".....	183
I.Ya. Kiselev, "Collective Bargains Under State Monopoly Capitalism: Their Class Meaning".....	186
Books in Brief.....	189
Authors of This Issue.....	192

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1984

11499

CSO: 1807/300

INTERNATIONAL

INFORMATION ON AUTHORS

Moscow RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR in Russian No 4, Jul-Aug 84 (signed to press 13 Jul 84) p 192

[Text] OUR AUTHORS

Gus Hall: general secretary of the Communist Party of the USA

Zagladin, Vadim Valentinovich: doctor of philosophical sciences, professor
Bel'chuk, Aleksandr Ivanovich: doctor of economic sciences, deputy director of the International Workers' Movement Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences

Blinova, Yelena Petrovna: candidate of historical sciences, senior scientific associate at the International Workers' Movement Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences

Latsis, Otto Rudol'fovich: doctor of economic sciences, department head at the Institute of Economics of the World Socialist System of the USSR Academy of Sciences

Mashezerskaya, Lidiya Yakovlevna: candidate of philosophical sciences, senior scientific associate at the International Workers' Movement Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences

Braginskiy, Moisey Isaakovich: doctor of historical sciences, senior scientific associate at the Africa Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences

Rybalkin, Igor' Yevgen'yevich: candidate of historical sciences

Karavayev, Aleksandr Petrovich: candidate of economic sciences, senior scientific associate at the Latin America Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences

Sokolov, Andrey Konstantinovich: candidate of historical sciences, docent in the History Department of Moscow State University imeni M.V. Lomonosov

Suntsova, Yekaterina Germanovna: postgraduate in the History Department of Moscow State University imeni M.V. Lomonosov

Semiryaga, Mikhail Ivanovich: doctor of historical sciences, section head at the International Workers' Movement Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1984

11499

CSO: 1807/300

INTERNATIONAL

ZAGLADIN ON MARXISM-LENINISM, INTERNATIONAL WORKING CLASS ROLE

Moscow RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNYY MIR in Russian No 4, Jul-Aug 84 (signed to press 13 Jul 84) pp 15-39

[Article by V.V. Zagladin; passages enclosed in slantlines printed in italics: "Marxism-Leninism on the Role of the Working Class in International Relations"]

[Text] International affairs and world politics are attracting especially close attention from people in all nations today. And this is not surprising. It is precisely there, in the area of international relations, that the question of man's future--the question of /preventing a nuclear catastrophe/--is being decided, after all.

The bourgeoisie have always attempted to surround their foreign policy dealings with a curtain of deep secrecy. This is becoming increasingly difficult today. Socialism's open and honest international policy and the unprecedented activity of social forces are ripping the cover of secrecy off the most cherished, secret plans and intentions involved in the diplomacy of the monopolies. A great deal still remains hidden, however. And since this is so, the Leninist principle of struggling "against diplomatic comedies, to explain the truth to the people and to expose international, antiproletarian reaction"¹ is still exceptionally important today. More than just the actual exposure of specific, refined combinations of bourgeois policy is needed, however, in order for that struggle to be adequately effective. It is no less important to have a thorough understanding /of the essence/ of international politics today, of the essence of the entire present system of international relations and the role of various classes and political forces in their development.

International relations have occupied the minds of scholarly students of social developments since the very earliest times, to be sure. Our earliest known written memorials of man's history ordinarily also touched upon relations among states, gave them their own interpretation and their own explanation. International relations have received more and more attention with the passage of time. Treatises have been written which not only explained the nature of international relations and their development--in their own way, of course--but also proposed various alternatives for transforming, improving and perfecting them.

These works were at best either descriptive or abstract and speculative, however. They could not provide a real analysis of international relations, if only because of the fact that the necessary scientific, theoretical

and methodological foundation was lacking. This foundation was created for the first time in the history of political thought in the works of K. Marx, F. Engels and V.I. Lenin, whose contribution to the development of the science of international relations is extraordinarily great. We refer to their study of the nature of these relations; their relationship to the society's productive forces and production relations and its superstructure; their importance in the development of the main form of the society's existence in the antagonistic phase of its class struggle; and their role in the development of the social progress of mankind as a whole. The fact should be stressed, however, that this contribution has not been fully studied by far. And these are things of extraordinary importance both from the standpoint of principle and theory and the practical standpoint.

I. Just what are international relations? What is their essence? K. Marx's well-known definition states that international relations are in the category of /"secondary or tertiary"/, generally /"production, transferred/, non-primary" production relations.² This tenet is of an extremely important fundamental nature and requires thoughtful study.

The basic element in K. Marx's thesis is that /international relations are a specific element of production relations/. At first glance this statement might appear contradictory, even debatable. After all, international relations are ordinarily taken to mean the total activity in the world arena primarily of various states.³ And this activity, that is, the foreign policy of states, is in a category of phenomena not of the foundation but of the superstructure. There is another aspect of international relations, however. The political actions of specific governments or the aggregate thereof reflect interrelations among states and national communities which are objectively conditioned and developing independently of that will, which (the interrelations) are based primarily on /economic/ factors.

When we consider this aspect of the matter we must turn to the conclusions of K. Marx and F. Engels pertaining to the /origin of international relations as a result of the development of the society's productive forces, and the needs produced by that development/.

As he studied the developmental process of the productive forces, K. Marx demonstrated that a social need for labor division and cooperation rises at a certain stage in that development. It is first created within the framework of a single enterprise, a specific branch, a group of branches, and then a state. The time ultimately arrives when there is a need for labor division and cooperation on an international scale. As the founders of scientific communism pointed out, it is precisely this need which is driving capital abroad and forcing it to take over the workforce and sources of raw materials in other nations and then, the /markets/. A world market comes into being. "A trend toward the creation of a /world/ market," K. Marx wrote, "is produced right in the very concept of capital. Every boundary serves as a limitation to be overcome."⁴ The merchants of a world market is nothing other than the birth of international division of labor and its international cooperation.

K. Marx regarded cooperation as a sort of new productive force.⁵ Precisely the same approach can be taken toward the assessment of international division of labor and its international cooperation. This is an important, qualitatively new stage in the development of human society's productive forces. And the forms of international division of labor and its international cooperation, naturally, can be extremely varied--they are of a historical nature. Under the conditions of an exploitative system they develop in a direction from the simplest international trade to the seizure of colonies, to the economic subordination of politically independent nations by the large powers, and then to the world's division into spheres of influence among the monopolistic organizations, specifically by exporting capital. Today we are dealing with both the processes of capitalist integration and the development of transnational corporations.

It is precisely on this basis that specific relations among states gradually develop. "All-round ties and all-round dependency of nations upon one another replace the old local and national isolation and an existence based upon one's own production,"⁶ stated the authors of the "Communist Party Manifesto." /International relations/ develop, which, by K. Marx's definition, "are an expression of a specific type of labor division."⁷ In other words, international relations are a result, the effect, of the development of productive forces, an essential element in the formation and development of the process of socialization of production, labor and exchange on an international scale--that is, their internationalization.

It is in the process of the internationalization of production, labor and exchange that the owners of the means of production in one nation enter into specific relations with the owners of means of production in another nation (or nations). At the same time the dominant classes of one nation are entering into specific relations also with the nondominant working-classes of other nations, which in this case are the object of oppression--now by "other" masters and not by their "own." All of these relations obviously constitute a specific part of production relations on the international scale.

The conclusion inevitably follows that /international relations are of a profoundly class nature/. Naturally, they cannot go against the social nature of the specific society or the nature of its production relations as a whole. We should particularly stress this fact, because throughout history the dominant, exploitative classes have always attempted, and are still attempting, to disguise the social nature of international relations, attempting to depict them as something outside of class or above class, something abstract and common to mankind.

Naturally, as we study the nature of international relations as a specific, dynamic, integral system, we should consider the possibility of simultaneous existence of states with different social structures or--and this is the same thing--with different bases. It is especially important for us to consider this today, when two opposite social systems--socialism and capitalism--exist side by side. Relations among states within each of these systems are based on the natural laws underlying the predominant mode of production in each of them. Relations among nations with different social systems also continue to exist, which (the relations) develop according to their own laws. We shall return to this subject.

This fact complicates the study of modern international relations, of course. This makes it all the more important to persistently proceed from the Marxist-Leninist positions on their class nature as a specific form of production relations, however. "To forget the class struggle which seethes throughout the world," V.I. Lenin wrote, "is to involuntarily help the imperialists of the world against the struggling proletariat."⁸ This warning by Lenin is still completely valid today.

When K. Marx spoke of the fact that international relations are in the category of production relations, however, he also stated that these relations are not primary, but "derivative" and "transferred" production relations. What does this mean?

Although, as we have stated, international relations are based upon substantive production relations which determine the nature of a given system, we are dealing with the second or even the third "stage," so to speak, of these relations: /not/ with interconnections and antagonisms, which, as a rule, emerge in the production process itself, but with interconnections and antagonisms which, rooted in the production sphere, are /brought out by the state, that is, by the political superstructure/.

This would be a good place to point out the fact that the essence of production relations of any society in every nation ordinarily manifests itself not directly but through the social ideas, institutions and other relations corresponding to it--that is, through the superstructure. International relations, however, as we have already stated, are the relations of dominant (or dominant and oppressed) classes of /various nations/, which have come through /two/ intermediate stages: through the political superstructure within each nation and through relations among the superstructures (states) of those nations. In this sense they are not primary relations, but are /derivative/ production relations /transferred/ from the sphere of direct class relations of the given (national) societies to the sphere of intra-class or inter-class (economic and political) relations on the international level.

To a significant degree this is precisely why international relations, while in principle so fully the same as the society's production relation as a whole and forming an inseparable union with them, at the same time also possess a certain degree of independence, of autonomous movement, as it were. It is also dependent upon both /objective/ and /subjective/ factors.

With respect to the objective aspect, the important thing is that it is not the classes of a given, specific national society, but the classes (dominant and nondominant) of various nations, which are interacting in international relations (as well as production relations). This interaction objectively and independently of the will and wishes of its individual participants brings about certain interconnections and conflicts (generated, among other things, by objective production needs on the world scale and by world market conditions), which are capable of imparting "autonomous" movement stimuli to international relations as a whole.

It should be noted, however, that the objective bases for a certain independence of international relations cannot be torn away or separated from their superstructure aspect. In fact, international relations develop as a resultant of

the subjective political will of various states in the world arena, or hypothetically speaking, as a resultant of the foreign policies of those states. The foreign policy of each nation is influenced primarily by the internal political situation of that nation, however.

At the same time, the foreign policy and international relations of any nation are influenced by the policies of other nations. As K. Marx stated it, "the boundaries of a modern national state" are themselves in turn economically "within the boundaries of the world market" and politically "within the boundaries of the system of states."⁹ And the status of that system and the nature of its development invariably also affect the international activeness of every government. Today, that activeness is influenced primarily by the nature and the characteristics of the confrontation between socialism and capitalism in the world arena, as well as by the struggle waged by the developing nations to consolidate their independence and to achieve social progress.

Naturally, no foreign influence (no matter how strong) can /fundamentally/ alter the foreign policy of any state or the nature of its international relations. Such a change requires a substantiative breakup of the given society's production relations--that is, the replacement of one dominant class by another.

And so, according to the Marxist-Leninist classics, international relations are a complex phenomenon with a certain inherent duality. On the one hand they are a "transferred" portion of production relations, but on the other hand they are a part of the superstructure of the given society, of the given social and economic formation. These two aspects are inseparably linked, while at the same time retaining their specific features. In the final analysis, international relations are of a profoundly class nature. They also possess a certain degree of independence, however, and are influenced by various kinds of circumstances, which must be taken into account for the development of a class approach to international affairs on the part of the working class--both that in power and that waging a struggle against exploiters within the bourgeois states.

II. The strength of the founders of Marxist doctrine lay not only in the depth of their insight into the specific fabric of their contemporary history and of international relations, but also, and particularly, in their theoretical generalizations, to which we shall now turn. Their conclusions still sound perfectly modern today. And this is not surprising. After all, despite all the stages of development which capitalism has undergone, its essence remains the same.

K. Marx and F. Engels reached the important conclusion about the bourgeois society's international relations that those relations are of a clearly defined class--that is, capitalist--nature. Since that time "...when trade relations among the European nations began acquiring substantial importance, international relations themselves therefore began taking on a /bourgeois/ nature...."¹⁰

But just what is the essence of bourgeois international relations? The answer to this question, which is contained in the works of the founders of Marxism, is the following. Bourgeois international relations, like all other areas of the capitalist society's activities, are subordinate primarily to the interest of creating the most favorable conditions for deriving surplus output, for its distribution and redistribution (and thereby, the exploitation and extreme exploitation of the working masses both of "one's own" nation and of other nations).

In the one case then, we are talking about relations of exploitation established by the capitalists of one nation with respect to the workers, the proletariat and the nonproletarian strata of another nation (or nations). In the other case, we are dealing with relationships of the competition, rivalry and struggle which are generally inherent in capitalism and in the dominance of private ownership, and which comprise an inseparable part of the nature of the capitalist system of production as such.

The two things are closely interlinked. In fact, production relative to surplus value, as K. Marx noted, calls for "...the investigation of all nature in order to reveal new and useful properties of things" and at the same time "the universal exchange of products of all foreign climates and nations...."¹¹ This "universal exchange of products," that is, the expansion of the sphere of exchange, K. Marx noted, creates for the capitalists "the possibility of using a larger quantity of additional labor,"¹²--in other words, to expand the sphere of exploitation of the working masses. "...As soon as peoples whose production is still being carried out with the relatively low forms of slave and corvée labor, and so forth, are drawn into a world market which the capitalist mode of production dominates and which has as its main interest the sale of products from that production abroad," K. Marx wrote, "the civilized horror of overwork is added to the barbarian horrors of slavery, feudalism and so forth."¹³

K. Marx believed that it is precisely in the world market where the exploitative features of the capitalist system are most completely manifested. "The universal relations" of the capitalist society "...are in their most highly developed form in their world market form...."¹⁴ Capital's predatory striving to derive as much surplus output as possible, no matter what, using, among other things, the difference in production and labor conditions which objectively exists in different natural and social conditions, manifests itself with special force in this area. The extremely profound conflict not only between the worker and the bourgeois of a given nation, but also between the working class and the bourgeoisie as two social poles of capitalism as a whole, become apparent and perceptible precisely in this area.

The "expansion of the sphere of exchange" takes place first as development of foreign trade turnover. This proves to be inadequate, however. The establishment of colonial domination by "advanced" states over nations less well developed was established as the optimal basis for the "universal exchange of products" for capitalism at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. Referring to the nature of colonial oppression, K. Marx arrived at the conclusion (first from an analysis of the Irish question and then of other problems pertaining to capital's colonial dominion in India, Africa and other areas) that it involved the most unscrupulous exploitation in the form of particularly harsh social and national oppression. He wrote the following: "...not only individual capitalists, but nations as well, can constantly engage in exchange with another, as well as continuously repeat the exchange on an ever greater scale, without receiving identical profits as a result. One nation can keep appropriating the surplus labor of another, without giving anything in return, but in this case a different standard is used than in the exchange between the capitalist and the worker."¹⁵

There was fierce competition, and conflicts, international crises and wars arose in the struggle to divide the world up into colonies and spheres of influence among the capitalist nations and their groupings. They became all the fiercer, when it came to redividing the colonies, spheres of influence, markets and so forth. In other words, the competition itself was an inevitable companion of capital's exploitation of other nations and peoples. And the area in which problems produced by the competition were practically resolved turned out to be international relations, turned out to be foreign policy, which the ruling bourgeoisie held firmly in its grip. "A bourgeois who engages in commercial dealings with distant foreign countries or who has to compete with them, F. Engels wrote, "cannot prosper without exerting a most direct influence upon the foreign policy of his state."¹⁶

It should be pointed out that the foreign policy of any bourgeois state is a tool for exploiting the working class, the workers not only of other nations, but also the working class, the people of labor, of "its" own nation. In this respect we can identify two main aspects of the matter.

The foreign policy of the capitalist nations has served and continues to serve as a weapon for defending the positions of a given national grouping of capital, that is, primarily for defending "its" domestic market--in other words, for providing the most favorable foreign conditions for the exploitation of "its" national work force. "A bourgeois," F. Engels wrote, "cannot secure his own interest without direct and constant control over the central government, the foreign policy and the legislation of his state."¹⁷

What does protecting favorable conditions or exploiting the work force mean in this case? It means, on the one hand, protecting "one's own" domestic market from encroachment by capitalist competitors. On the other hand, it means supporting external conditions which most facilitate capital's struggle against labor within the given nation. This later task is accomplished by various means.

In the ordinary, everyday situation the ruling bourgeoisie uses the sphere of international relations for purposes of disguising and concealing the nature of its state's exploitative system, /diverting the attention of the working masses to questions of foreign policy/, which it depicts, as we have already stated, as something "above-class" and "generally national." "...The industrial slave owners" K. Marx wrote, "...need a foreign policy which can divert attention away from domestic issues."¹⁸ This idea was formulated even more clearly and graphically in another place. K. Marx felt that the bourgeois state's foreign policy pursues, among other goals, that of "paralyzing democratic energy, of taking attention away from itself, of diverting the flow of revolutionary lava to the side, of forging weapons for internal oppression...."¹⁹

The bourgeoisie's foreign policy also pursues the goal--and this is its permanent function--of isolating "its own" proletariat from their class brothers in other nations.

K. Marx directed attention more than once to the phenomenon of /competition/ among individual workers and groups of the working class. While revealing the

objective nature of this competition, he also demonstrated that in principle it can be overcome by the working class, for which the unity of class interests is unquestionably above the private, group or regional interests of individual groups of the working class. The bourgeoisie's deliberate actions prevent this, however. The bourgeoisie does everything possible to perpetuate and intensify competition not just among individual groups of workers at enterprises, among the workers of individual enterprises within a branch, individual branches within a nation, and so forth, but also between various national groups of workers on both the national and the international scale.

Capital's interest in whipping up such "international" competition among proletarians is perfectly apparent and understandable. One of its favorite tools in this area (speaking of relations among the workers of various nations and various countries) is bourgeois nationalism, which K. Marx and F. Engels described more than once as the most vicious enemy of the workers, one which not only prevents them from securing better terms for selling their labor, but also bars the way to the proletariat's national and social liberation. K. Marx believed that in its pursuit of criminal goals, capital's foreign policy plays on national prejudices and sheds the people's blood and squanders their wealth in predatory wars.²⁰

And so, /bourgeois nationalism/ is nothing other than an /instrument of exploitation/ of the proletariat, and not just on a national scale but on an international scale as well.

While the bourgeoisie makes active use of the "divide and conquer" tactic against its class antipode, it also uses another method in the struggle--that of uniting its own forces against the proletariat, despite all of the contradictions which exist among its individual groups. International relations are precisely the sphere in which this interdependence of bourgeoisie and its alliance against the proletariat are manifested most clearly.

Analyzing the forms of this interdependence and this alliance, K. Marx stressed two aspects of the matter. One was the fact that during any "normal" period in history relationships among the capitalist states are always to one degree or another /a form of collaboration/ by their bourgeoisie, a form of "fraternal alliance of the bourgeoisie of all nations,"²¹ ultimately directed against the proletariat. "...The bourgeoisie of all nations," K. Marx wrote, "are linked by fraternal ties and united against the proletarians of all nations, despite their mutual struggle and competition in the world market."²² The other was the fact that in those cases when the proletariat poses a serious threat to the bourgeoisie's class profits, it, the bourgeoisie, is capable of refusing to defend the national interests, capable even of making a purely economic compromise not to its advantage in an attempt to preserve the most important thing--its class positions, its class dominance. K. Marx considered the conduct of the French bourgeoisie during the period of the Franco-Prussian War and the Paris Commune to be a typical example of this line.

"After the most terrible war of recent time," he wrote "the victorious army and the conquered army have united to jointly take bloody reprisals against the proletariat. This unheard-of event... demonstrates the complete disintegration of the old bourgeois society. (...) Class domination can no longer be

concealed under the cloak of nationalism; against the proletariat the national governments are /essentially united/."23

One of the conclusions which K. Marx proved from this was that the bourgeoisie subordinates international relations to its highest interest, that of preserving its class dominance. "The European governments," he wrote, "demonstrated to Paris the international nature of its class domination."24

This confirms once again the directly bourgeois, capitalistic nature of international relations in the era of capital's domination and /confirms the conclusion/ that international relations are a specific part of capitalism's production relations.

Finally, K. Marx devoted special attention to /wars/. He regarded wars as a natural result of the domination of private ownership in general and of capitalist private ownership in particular, as one of the "normal" forms of the capitalist way of life. Marx revealed the nature of wars under capitalism as both a tool of capitalist competition and a tool of class domination by the bourgeoisie over the proletariat.

During the period of imperialism, and especially during the beginning of man's transition from capitalism to socialism, international relations were naturally unable to undergo further evolution. V.I. Lenin made a study of that evolution, which is being continued by his successors.

Lenin's analysis of international relations has been studied considerably more extensively than the analysis made by K. Marx. The fact should be stressed, however, that it is based entirely on Marx's methodology and continues the clarification of K. Marx's theoretical conclusions. Without going into detail, it should be mentioned that V.I. Lenin introduced the following extremely important elements into the Marxist analysis of international relations.

V.I. Lenin first of all revealed the intensification of the class, exploitative nature of foreign policy and international relations in the era of imperialism, which resulted from the very nature of monopolistic capitalism and from the natural trends involving the division of the world among states and monopolies, world domination and world war. Summing up capitalism's development at the beginning of the 20th century, V.I. Lenin wrote the following: "Capitalism has grown into a worldwide system of colonial oppression and financial suffocation of a huge majority of the earth's population by a handful of 'advanced' nations."25 Summarizing the book "Finance Capital" by R. Hilferding, V.I. Lenin wrote the following: "The representation of finance capital is now becoming an extremely important function of diplomacy."26

V.I. Lenin studied the substantial growth of the specific importance of international relations in both the society's economy and its policy, including the class struggle, as the internationalization of production and exchange increased sharply and irradically in the era of domination by the monopolies. With respect to the principles for working out the political strategy and tactics for the working class, V.I. Lenin repeatedly stressed the fact that they must be based not just on "strictly objective consideration of all the given state's forces," but also on the consideration of /all/ class forces of "the states surrounding it, and of all states on the world scale."27

If we look at these conclusions of V.I. Lenin from the standpoint of K. Marx's overall description of the nature of international relations, we can say that during that period when capitalism turned into imperialism, international relations became a part of its production relations to a /far greater degree/ and more directly a part of them than was the case in the 19th century. This was a result of their increased role as a tool for deriving surplus output and for distributing and redistributing it in the interest of the huge capitalist monopolies. The reactionary nature of monopolistic capitalism's international policy increased significantly as a result.

In his analysis of capitalism V.I. Lenin especially stressed the matter /of militarism's increased role/ in the capitalist society's life. He pointed out that particularly rapid development of the military and the arms race, and the swelling of military industry and the military monopolies are inherent in imperialism.

V.I. Lenin made an in-depth analysis of imperialistic militarism as something directed simultaneously "inside" the bourgeois nation--that is, against the proletariat--and "outside"--that is, against the proletariat of other nations, against the peoples of the colonies and against competitors. In both forms imperialistic militarism is the most dangerous form of capital's class domination for the workers. V.I. Lenin described it as "...a weapon in the hands of the dominant classes used for suppressing any kind of movement (economic or political) by the proletariat...."²⁸ Since this is so, a particularly active struggle must be waged against it.

Another aspect of this problem which drew V.I. Lenin's special attention were /world wars/ as a phenomenon inherent in imperialism, created by it and posing all the greater danger as scientific and technological progress produces new technical military weapons capable of destroying the conditions for human society's existence.

When he studied the experience of the war of 1914-1918 V.I. Lenin stated that imperialism's world wars are not just a struggle for markets and for the plundering of other nations, but also "an attempt to stultify, divide and break the proletarians of all nations by setting the hired slaves of one nation against the hired slaves of another to benefit the bourgeoisie...."²⁹

Lenin's statement that imperialist governments "...are increasingly inclined to engage in desperate adventures in the face of an invincible procession toward victory by millions in the working class."³⁰ V.I. Lenin wrote that a victorious proletarian revolution in one or several nations should "produce not just clashes but also a direct attempt by the bourgeoisie of other nations to destroy the victorious proletariat of the socialist state."³¹ Lenin's conclusion has been confirmed totally and completely by the entire course of subsequent history.

Lenin's theses which we have cited are especially important today when the processes of capitalist production's internationalization have reached the level of integration and accelerated development of the transnational corporations. This is creating a truly worldwide system for the exploitation of a significant part of mankind by a handful of super-monopolies aligned with the state and competing with one another but also collaborating with one another in the struggle

against socialism, against all fighters for the national and social liberation of peoples. Imperialist foreign policy and imperialism's entire system of contemporary international relations actually serve one purpose--to provide political support for the functioning of this system for capital's oppression of people of labor on a global scale.

The reactionary nature and the adventurism of contemporary monopolistic capital's international policy truly know no bounds. The actions of R. Reagan's Administration in the USA are the pinnacle of that reaction and adventurism. It has now absolutely openly proclaimed a course of turning back social progress and retarding world history in the interest of preserving the imperialist system of class and national oppression. Modern imperialism is prepared to risk a nuclear war for the sake of those goals.

In the situation today the struggle to prevent war, to prevent a world military catastrophe continues to be the most important task not just of the workers, but of all mankind, especially when we consider the development of various types of weapons of mass destruction. "...The complexity of the situation," General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee K.Yu. Chernenko has stated, "makes it essential for us to double and triple our efforts in the conduct of our policy of peace and international cooperation."³²

And so, in the final analysis capitalist society's international relations are subordinated entirely to the goal of assuring the best and most favorable conditions for deriving surplus value both within its nation and abroad, of assuring the most favorable conditions for exploiting the workforce in its own nation and other nations regarded by each specific bourgeoisie as a potential "sphere of application for its forces."

From the standpoint of relations among the exploiting classes of various nations, as we have already stated, these are a matter of competition, of a competitive struggle. From the standpoint of the working class, we are dealing with peculiar manifestations of antagonistic relations between capital and labor in both the national and the international arena, including, of course, the struggle between the two opposite world social systems.

III. According to the teachings of K. Marx and V.I. Lenin the proletariat should wage its struggle against the bourgeoisie from all /three/ main bridge-heads--economic, political and theoretical. Only then can it be assured of victory. With respect to the political aspect of the matter, problems of international policy cannot but occupy a prominent place in its public activity.

It must be pointed out in connection with this that the social liberation of any nation's working class occurs in the presence of two groups of conditions--internal and external. Naturally, the internal conditions--that is, the degree of maturation of conflicts in the capitalist system and the degree of "readiness" of capitalism in the given nation for large social changes--are the crucial ones. External conditions--the international situation as a whole, the balance of power in the world and so forth--are assuming ever increasing importance as time passes, however (due primarily to the objective processes of internationalization of production and exchange). Consequently, the struggle in matters of foreign policy, the struggle for the democratization of international relations, is of fundamental interest to the working class not just from the

standpoint of the present (that is, from the standpoint of the struggle to improve conditions for selling the work force), but also from the future perspective (that is, the struggle for social revolution, for the replacement of capitalism by socialism).

Since, as we have seen, capitalism's international relations make up one of the spheres of labor's exploitation, the working class is vitally interested in constantly influencing foreign policy and the entire system of international relations of the bourgeois states, and in restricting those aspects or features especially hostile to labor. This task is perfectly realistic and feasible.

The foreign policy of any bourgeois state is influenced by the working class, as is its domestic policy. Class struggle and direct protests by the workers against specific actions of the bourgeois governments in the international arena constitute the main means of exercising that influence. The proletariat's political parties, their representatives in the parliaments, their trade unions and other class organizations are also extremely important means by which the working class can affect the nation's foreign policy, thereby affecting the international relations of capitalism as a whole.

In order for the proletariat to launch a struggle in foreign policy matters, of course, it must recognize the importance of that struggle and understand that foreign policy is not something far removed from its interests or even alien to it. The development of this kind of awareness is complicated by the fact that the bourgeoisie is constantly engaged in the intensive ideological and political processing of the masses in order "to prove" that its foreign policy actually serves the interests of the entire nation and therefore those of the workers. There is no reason to interfere in foreign policy matters.

K. Marx and F. Engels devoted an enormous amount of attention to the study of foreign policy and international relations with a view primarily to developing in the working masses an aware and responsible attitude toward foreign policy problems. K. Marx plainly stated that it is the duty of the working class "...itself to master the secrets of international policy, to follow the diplomatic activities of its governments and if necessary, to use all means at its disposal to counter those activities; and if it is impossible to halt those activities, to unite for their immediate exposure and to strive to see that the simple laws of morality and justice which private individuals should follow in their relationships become the highest laws also in relations among peoples.

K. Marx stated that the struggle for this kind of foreign policy "comprises a part of the overall struggle for the liberation of the working class."³³

What are the /main directions/, the main lines, of that struggle according to K. Marx and F. Engels, however?

The founders of scientific communism and the international communist movement attached enormous importance first of all to systematic actions against the /wars of predation and oppression/ conducted by the bourgeoisie. In all cases, K. Marx underscored, the workers in general are the main victim of wars. The popular masses bear the brunt of the disasters and the adversities linked with wars. A resolution of the 2nd Congress International, which K. Marx helped to

prepare, contained the following words, still valid and important today: "The burden of war lies mainly on the working class, not only depriving it of its means of existence, but also forcing it to shed its blood. The armed world paralyzes the productive forces, demands useless items of production's labor and holds all of production under the fear of war."³⁴ This is precisely why the working class is vitally interested in halting wars as well as the arms race policy.

The struggle against wars, according to K. Marx and F. Engels, is closely linked with the working class's struggle against /bourgeois nationalism/, against the policy of alienating the workers of various nations and setting certain groups of them against others.

"If the liberation of the working class requires the fraternal cooperation of the workers," K. Marx wrote, "then how can they perform this great task in the presence of a foreign policy which pursues criminal goals, plays on national prejudices, sheds the blood and plunders the wealth of the people in predatory wars"?³⁵ "...I am convinced that /only the working class/ is the true force capable of opposing the rebirth of national discord and the entire present diplomacy,"³⁶ he wrote in another place.

And finally, K. Marx and F. Engels believed that, perfectly naturally, the struggle against capital's /colonialist/ policy is completely and entirely in keeping with the interests of the working class. K. Marx arrived at the conclusion that international relations based on the subordination of certain nations to others are fundamentally contrary to the interests of the working class. It is vitally interested in eliminating them. And from this came the universally known and extremely important conclusion that the social liberation of peoples of the developed nations and the metropolitan states is inseparable from the elimination of their bourgeoisie's colonial domination of other peoples, from the elimination of capitalism's colonial system as such. "A people which oppresses other peoples cannot be free," is how K. Marx and F. Engels expressed their position in brief, almost aphoristic form.

"...The working class," K. Marx stated, "has its own foreign policy, which is not at all guided by that which the bourgeoisie considers proper."³⁷

K. Marx and F. Engels regarded the work performed by the working class in its own nation to alter the nature of the bourgeois government's foreign policy to be one of its most urgent tasks. They attached enormous importance to the /proletariat's international collaboration/ in the struggle against the bourgeoisie's international policy and to the international influence exerted by the workers of various nations upon capital's foreign policy and its entire system of international relations.

In fact, since questions of foreign policy and international relations never involve the national interests of only a single nation but inevitably affect the interests of other nations, and in some cases--the prevention of nuclear war, for example--the interests of all mankind, the working movement's class struggle on international political matters is of an international and not just a national nature in a far more immediate form than any other area of its action.

It is not surprising that K. Marx, and F. Engels with him, attached truly exceptional importance to internationalism and the international solidarity of the working class of various nations as the main weapon for combating the essentially egotistical and exploitative international policy of the bourgeois governments. "...They (the workers--V.Z.) must counter the fraternal alliance of the bourgeoisie of all nations with an alliance of the workers of all nations,"³⁸ K. Marx stated.

/The question of internationalism is perhaps the main question in the struggle by the working class against the antipopular foreign policy of the bourgeois states/. K. Marx wrote the following: "...Disregard for the fraternal alliance which must exist among the workers of various nations and motivate them to stand firmly behind one another in their struggle for liberation carries the penalty of overall defeat for their divided efforts."³⁹ And the founders of scientific communism attempted to do everything possible to incorporate that fraternal alliance in practical action.

The very first international meetings organized by the Communist Alliance and then the first International with the direct participation of K. Marx were to a significant degree devoted precisely to international problems. At the appeal of the International and under its guidance the European workers took action against the aggressive policy of the ruling circles of Prussia, France, Austria-Hungary and Great Britain.⁴⁰ On 12 May 1869 K. Marx could say with complete justification: "...now, finally, the working class is entering the arena of history not as an obedient agent, but as an independent force aware of its own responsibility and capable of dictating peace where its so-called masters scream for war."⁴¹

Without specially discussing this matter in greater detail, it should nonetheless be stressed that K. Marx's conclusion on the importance of international solidarity as the most important tool of the working class for affecting the capitalist society's international relations has been completely confirmed throughout the entire subsequent development of history. In fact, proletarian internationalism and the international solidarity of the working class have been and remain the main factor in the successes achieved by the worker's movement in the struggle against capital's antipopular foreign policy. Inadequate solidarity or its weak manifestation, on the other hand, and especially a deviation from the principles of international solidarity, have ordinarily resulted in the proletariat's defeat and opened up new opportunities for the bourgeoisie and its foreign policy.

The possibilities of the workers' movement were extremely limited in the first phases of its development, of course. It could not have a significant effect upon the development of international relations. Analyzing the possibilities of the working class and its organizations for affecting the bourgeoisie's international policy, however, K. Marx and V.I. Lenin after him pointed out that with the passage of time these possibilities /increase/ due to the following circumstances.

In the first place, the working class and the workers' movement in each nation gradually build up their strength and therefore also their possibilities for affecting the policy of the ruling circles in their nations and their foreign policy specifically.

In the second place, the scale and effectiveness of the international collaboration of various organizations of the workers and various groups of the working class are constantly increasing, and this naturally provides the proletariat with the possibility of affecting international policy more effectively. This formulation takes on additional meaning today, when a different distribution of forces has developed in the world arena, when there exists the world system of socialism, influential groups of revolutionary-democratic states and the non-aligned movement advocating the protection of peace throughout the world, and when a world communist movement, a movement of the social democracy, international trade union centers and other organizations of the working class exist and are active.

In the third place, an important role is performed by the fact that questions of international policy, particularly such an important question as the problem of war and peace, affect not just the class interests of the proletariat, but to an enormous degree the common democratic interests of the very broadest groups. V.I. Lenin emphasized the fact that "the most important manifestation of democracy is basically the question of war and peace."⁴²

This means that the working class can count on the support of extremely broad social forces for its practical efforts to democratize international relations and to curb imperialism's aggressive forces. As a matter of fact, this was always the case, beginning with the First International, which received the support of the broad European community when it spoke out on matters of international relations. Today, the objective coincidence of the proletariat's class interests and those of the society's broad democratic circles in matters of international policy has essentially become the foundation for the enlargement of the group of forces taking antiwar positions and advocating a struggle against the nuclear missile threat on the part of imperialism, particularly in Europe, which is occurring on an increasingly perceptible scale.

And so, the workers' movement unquestionably has possibilities for affecting a state's international relations and foreign policy, and they are increasing with time. In order to soberly assess the scale and the limits of these possibilities, we must turn once again to certain of K. Marx's basic conclusions. The main thing is that since international relations constitute a specific part of production relations, that is, they are primarily of a /basic/ nature, it is clear that they cannot go against their own social nature. In other words, as we have already stated, they cannot change or be altered unless there is a change in the nature of the productive forces and production relations of the society as a whole.

Plans for transforming the foreign policy of any capitalist nation in a truly democratic spirit as long as capital has economic dominance in the nation can be termed utopian. Partial, individual changes and certain advances toward democracy are possible--this has already been discussed--but a fundamental transformation of the capitalist state's foreign policy is impossible so long as the society's base remains capitalistic.

The above fully applies not just to the policy of a single nation, but to the international relations of capitalism as a whole. "...In the field of international relations," Marx stressed, "the industrial monopoly is transformed

directly into political domination...."⁴³ As long as there is an industrial monopoly, international relations will remain a sphere of its political domination.

It is clear in light of what we have said that the ideas sometimes advanced in certain circles of Western Europe's leftist community about "democratizing" the European Economic Community or some international organizations created by international finance capital to serve its own needs have no real basis. The positions of the leftist parties in the EEC parliament can be strengthened, of course, and its rostrum can be used for promoting democratic ideas. And this should obviously be done. This will to no degree alter the actual nature of the EEC, however, which is the creation and the obedient tool of large capital.

/Capitalist international relations have been and remain an instrument for exploiting not just the working class, but the working masses in general/. And not just the working masses of nations in which developed capitalist relations have long existed, but also of nations to some degree independent of the imperialist states. We derive from this the important conclusion that it is possible and necessary to unite the efforts of both groups in a struggle to democratize international relations.

A certain democratization of international relations in the capitalist world is possible only as a result of struggle, a result of a certain ratio of forces, that is, a result of forcing capitalism to soften and moderate some aspects of its policy, which reflects the essence of the capitalist system.

IV. A fundamentally new phase began in the development of the struggle by the international working class against imperialism's antipopular foreign policy and its entire system of international relations the moment the Great October Socialist Revolution was victorious.

K. Marx and F. Engels foresaw the fact that when the working class came to power it would substantially alter the overall situation of international relations. "...In contrast to the old society with its economic poverty and political madness, a new society will come into being, whose international principle will be--/peace/--because every people will have one and the same master--/labor/!"⁴⁴ K. Marx wrote. And F. Engels stated in turn: "...the triumph of the proletariat... will destroy class antagonisms and wars among peoples and will bring peace and happiness in the civilized nations."⁴⁵ The foresight of the great teachers of the proletariat was confirmed in the experience first of the Great October Socialist Revolution and then socialist revolutions in a number of other nations of the world.

Having taken state power into their own hands, the working class and its allies immediately and fundamentally alter the essence of their nation's foreign policy and bring it into conformity with the new society's class nature. An extremely profound, fundamental distinction between socialism's policy and that of imperialism lies in the basic and crucial fact that socialist policy is the policy of a state of the workers, a policy inspired not by the interests of business--military or nonmilitary--but by the interests of the working class, the peasantry and the labor intelligentsia. "...The deepest roots of both our state's foreign and domestic policy are defined by the economic interests and the economic status of our state's dominant classes,"⁴⁶ V.I. Lenin wrote immediately after the October Revolution.

The nature of the new, socialist society's foreign policy was thoroughly revealed in Lenin's Peace Decree, which actually became the slogan for the international activities of the entire commonwealth of states of the victorious working class. "...The most precious thing for us is the preservation of peace and a full opportunity to devote all our efforts to restoring the economy..."⁴⁷ V.I. Lenin said soon after the end of the civil war. "The struggle to lessen the threat of war and restrain the arms race has been and remains the key direction for the foreign policy activities of the party and the state,"⁴⁸ L.I. Brezhnev stated at the 26th CPSU Congress. "The achievement of a lasting peace and defense of the right of peoples to independence and social progress are the unvarying goals of our foreign policy,"⁴⁹ Yu.V. Andropov stated at the November 1982 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. "...The Leninist policy of peace, the main features of which at the contemporary historical stage were defined by decisions of recent CPSU congresses, conform to the Soviet people's basic interests and actually to the interests of the world's other peoples. And we state resolutely that we shall not retreat one step from that policy,"⁵⁰ K.Yu. Chernenko stated at the February 1984 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee.

The victory of socialist revolution in Russia and the revolution in foreign policy which followed were immediately felt throughout the entire area of international relations. In fact, since the working class came to power two social systems--socialist and capitalist--and not one, have existed and functioned in the world. Each of them has its own foreign policy, its own approach to world affairs. Advances in international relations are understandably becoming even more substantial and noticeable since the working class has been coming to power in several states and since the world system of socialist states has been forming.

The birth of the socialist Soviet State and then of the group of socialist nations fundamentally altered the situation in the world for the international working class as a whole.

First of all, the working class, organized into a state, is an independent and equal subject of international relations. It establishes relations along state lines both with imperialist nations and with all other nations.

This means that prior to the emergence of world socialism international relations were only an /indirect object/, as it were, of the workers' struggle, which they could affect to a significant degree only indirectly. International relations are now becoming /a direct field of political action/ of the working class which is in power, a field of international class struggle, which is now being carried directly into the sphere of international relations.

Functioning as an equal subject of international relations in the world arena, the working class of the socialist nations is developing its activities in the following main directions.

It is organizing its diplomatic activities so as to provide a reliable defense for the conquests of socialism and to create the most favorable external conditions for the building of the new socialist and communist society.

In addition, the working class, while firmly rebuffing imperialism's aggressive policy, is doing everything possible to establish peaceful relations among states with different social systems.

The working class of the socialist nations provides active support for the liberation movement of peoples struggling for national liberation and social progress.

Finally, the working class of the socialist nations does everything possible to properly counteract the policy of exporting counter-revolution conducted by the imperialist nations.

We can see that the main directions in the activities of the socialist nations' working class in the international arena coincide in great part with the directions taken by the working class of the nonsocialist states in their activities. And this is not surprising, since in the final analysis their class interests coincide, and this is especially convincingly manifested precisely in the international arena, in the area of the anti-imperialist, antiwar struggle.

Karl Marx linked prospects and possibilities for the proletariat's international solidarity mainly with an increase in the awareness and interaction of the separate, national groups of workers. The importance of such interaction is increasing today, due primarily to the existence of world socialism. V.I. Lenin regarded the alliance between the workers of the socialist republics and the workers--particularly the working class--of the nonsocialist world as a new force in international relations, for which particularly great possibilities are opening up. He stressed the fact that the socialist republics are vitally interested in support from the international proletariat, on the one hand, and that it is entirely in the interest of the world's working class to support the international relations developed by socialism and to protect the socialist states against aggressive encroachments on the part of imperialism, on the other hand. The entire course of history has completely confirmed the correctness of Lenin's belief that the existence and the strengthening of socialism and the Soviet State are needed "by the world communist proletariat for combating the world bourgeoisie and as protection against the latter's intrigues."⁵¹

Today, when the power of world socialism and the strength of the workers' movement have increased many times over, not only the fate of universal peace, but also the fate of social progress as a whole, depend upon collaboration between the workers, the working class and the communist parties of the capitalist nations with the vanguard of the new, socialist world's workers' movement. It is therefore clear that any attempts to undermine that collaboration, to weaken and especially, to sever the ties between the two largest groups in the workers' movement, in whatever form they might be made, can only do the most serious harm both to the cause of peace and to the cause of the working class's liberation struggle.

The appearance in the world arena of a system of socialist states also substantially altered the conditions for the struggle by those groups of the working class active in the capitalist world. Each of them independently determines the strategy and the tactics for its struggle, of course. But the workers of

the nonsocialist world can now rely upon the assistance and support of the working class in the socialist nations in their struggle against imperialism's aggressive actions. It can be said that to a certain degree /socialism represents the basic interests of the entire, world working class in the international arena/.

The international communist movement which emerged following the October Revolution also had to affect the nature and the specific features of international relations as a whole. Practically from the first days of its existence the communist movement was able to function in the world arena as a powerful, organized political force opposing imperialism as a whole. The activities of the communist movement in the world arena have been and will continue to be far more effective than those of the international workers' movement prior to October. As an important factor in the balance of political forces, the world communist movement actually also functions as a subject of international relations, even though it does not constitute any sort of state agency.

There is no question that the practical proposals offered by the communists on international matters in such forums as the Karlovy Vary Conference of 1967, the Moscow Conference of 1969, the Berlin Conference of 1976 and others were an indisputable contribution to the development of international relations, and the struggle for the implementation of those proposals had a significant affect upon the entire world situation.

The activities of the Socialist International have also played a certain role in recent decades as a factor in international relations. Despite all its inconsistency on a number of issues and despite significant differences in the positions taken by individual socialist and social democratic parties, the Socialist International's orientation toward struggle against the danger of war which was worked out during the second half of the '70s, has become a significant element in the development of the system of international relations as a whole. This element is all the more important, because many socialist and social democratic parties either have been or are the ruling parties. In the latter case they have the opportunity to directly affect the world situation also through state channels.

The victory of national liberation revolutions, the development of which was also motivated by world socialism, by its emergence and successful development, also brought substantial advances in the system of international relations. This is also one of the factors altering the overall picture of modern international relations to a considerable degree. Nations liberated from colonial oppression and other developing states are now objectively serving as allies of world socialism in the struggle against international capital's aggressive, exploitative forces. Naturally, this applies primarily to those nations which have taken a course of revolutionary democratic development. Those nations consistently conduct a progressive, anti-imperialist foreign policy. Other liberated states which took the path of non-alignment are also increasingly directing their actions in the world arena primarily against imperialism.

Finally, the community, the democratic organizations and movements operating from the position of international solidarity, from the position of the antiwar

struggle, have also began playing a new role in world affairs since October. /In other words, socialism's establishment in the world arena made the popular masses and their organizations also an important subject of international relations/.

And so, /the structure of international relations/ has been altered significantly since October. It has become a branched and multistoried structure, so to speak. These relations are ordinarily defined in Soviet literature as "the sum total of economic, political, ideological, legal, diplomatic and military ties and relationships among peoples, among states and systems of states, among the main social, economic and political forces and organizations operating in the world arena."⁵²

The affect of the changes was certainly not limited to the structure of international relations, however. Their /social substance/ was also affected.

First of all, as we have already mentioned, contemporary international relations do not have just a capitalist base. The foreign policy and the international policy, first of Soviet Russia and then of an entire system of socialist states, now have the social and economic base of the new, socialist society. Two social systems of international relations, antagonistically opposed with respect to class nature, have actually emerged.

"While assessing the era we are living through from the standpoint of dialectical materialism, Marxist philosophy resolutely rejects attempts to negate the basically opposite natures of the two world systems, while at the same time affirming the substantive unity of modern man, the unity of his fate and his ultimate prospects,"⁵³ an editorial in the magazine VOPROSY FILOSOFII correctly points out.

Today's global system of international relations now includes three /main/ subsystems--socialist international relations; capitalist international relations; relations among states with different social systems.

In general the class nature of world international relations is determined primarily by the struggle between the two world social systems. It is a fact of fundamental importance that since the victory of the October Revolution imperialism has lost its international political monopoly, and since the establishment of the world socialist system and especially since the achievement of strategic military parity between the USSR and the USA, between the Warsaw Pact Organization and NATO, it has also been deprived of the international political initiative in the historical respect. The initiative is going over to the socialist states. With the passage of time the influence of the socialist system of international relations upon relations among all other states and upon the general nature of international development is becoming increasingly apparent.

This influence is also manifesting itself in the specific features of contemporary relations in the capitalist world. The nature of all those relations remains unchanged today, of course. They are still the same exploitative relations. The laws underlying the development of capitalist international relations, however, which are essentially oppressive, are manifested in a new situation with certain adjustments resulting precisely from socialism's affect upon the entire system of these relations, as well as the effect of powerful social forces operating from progressive positions.

We should add one more element to this. While still exploitative, the actual system of capitalist international relations has also changed internally to a certain degree as a result of the influence exerted upon it by the nonhomogeneous nature of the world today. We are referring primarily to the position of states liberated from colonial oppression and their activities in the world arena. From the standpoint of their class essence, most of those states, including the non-aligned states, are capitalist nations. They are still within the sphere of influence of the capitalist system of world management. The extent of the conflicts between them and world imperialism, however, as we have already stated, gives their foreign policy a unique and in great part, anti-imperialist, cast. And this has to be reflected in the overall situation in world politics. This is adequately illustrated, for example, by the situation which has developed in the U.N., in which the USA and its closest imperialist allies are finding themselves isolated more and more frequently.

The change occurring in the structure and the social nature of international relations in our time had to affect also the political trends in their development as a whole.

Since the Great October Revolution socialism, first in the person of our nation and then socialism as a system, set itself the goal of achieving the /democratizing of the entire system of international relations/. This goal was formulated by V.I. Lenin in his Peace Decree. V.I. Lenin and the communists understood, of course, that this task could not be completely accomplished as long as imperialism exists. For example, V.I. Lenin stated that "...the idea that a so-called democratic world is possible without a number of revolutions is thoroughly erroneous."⁵⁴ On the other hand, however, he could clearly see that socialism's influence upon world relations could be extremely significant and that everything necessary had to be done to realize the possibilities in this area.

Socialism's struggle to democratize the system of international relations, supported by the international working class, has been and continues to be conducted in various directions. We refer primarily to the establishment of fundamentally new relations, socialist relations, among the nations in which the working class has been victorious. We are also talking about the establishment of new, non-exploitative relations with the developing nations and finally, about the establishment of relations of peaceful coexistence with the capitalist states--that is, about the struggle to eliminate wars from the life of society. And significant advances have been achieved in each of these areas since the October Revolution.

First of all, /on the new international relations which have developed among the socialist nations/.

V.I. Lenin described relations among the Soviet republics as the relations of mutual assistance and mutual support necessary both for successful economic and political development and, also, primarily for defense against attacks by the imperialist world. Attempts to exploit one another have been eliminated in these relations, he emphasized. It is a matter of all-round, comradely cooperation.

Relations among nations in the socialist commonwealth are characterized on the one hand by the consistent observance of democratic standards of interaction

among governments, worked out on the basis of centuries of experience--such standards as equality, mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial inviolability, and the rejection of interference in the internal affairs of one another and the imposition of one nation's experience upon other fraternal nations. "The proclamation of equal rights for all nations," V.I. Lenin wrote, "was a deception for the bourgeoisie, but for us it will be the truth which will facilitate and accelerate the process of drawing all nations over to our side."⁵⁵

On the other hand, as Yu. Novopashin points out with complete justification, "as relations of the proletariat with a state organization, the new type of international relations take in the internationalist legacy of the world communist and workers' movement, the long-range strategic goal of which is to unite the efforts of the working class of various nations in a struggle against exploitation, a struggle for the complete and final liberation of labor, for the ultimate overcoming of all national isolation and an all-round coming together of free nations and peoples."⁵⁶ This legacy is embodied in socialist internationalism.

"The history of world socialism has confirmed the fact that the socialist system creates every possibility for the society's confident progress and for harmonious relations among nations," it was stated at the June 1983 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. "We see many examples of these possibilities being realized on the basis of the principles of socialist internationalism, which include both absolute respect for the sovereign rights of each nation and mutual, comradely support and mutual assistance. Experience has shown, however, that all of this does not simply come about on its own. The correct political line is essential for realizing these possibilities."⁵⁷

When we assess the present situation of our nations, we can say with satisfaction that the commonwealth of socialist states is now a powerful and healthy organism, which is playing an enormous, benevolent role in the modern world. Through joint efforts those nations are finding increasingly successful ways to combine the common interests of the commonwealth with those of each nation in it. We can still not say that all of the difficulties are behind us, of course, that we have achieved the ideal. That which was suitable yesterday, that which conformed to yesterday's tasks, needs to be improved today.

The Conference of High-Level Representatives of Members of the Council for Economic Mutual Assistance, held in Moscow in June of 1984, made a large contribution to the further all-round improvement of the system of relations among the fraternal socialist nations. Its decisions will contribute to the successful realization of the multifaceted tasks facing the socialist commonwealth.

The machinery of fraternal cooperation is highly diversified and includes not only relations among states, but also, and primarily, relations among the ruling communist and workers' parties, which are becoming the leading element and the basis for fraternal cooperation among the socialist states. Trade unions and other public organizations of the workers have also been brought into this machinery. Relations among local party and trade union organizations, among individual labor collectives, and so forth, have been established and are developing successfully. "Relations among states," it was stated at the 26th

CPSU Congress, "have long been referred to as international relations. Only in our time, however, in the world of socialism, have they truly become relations among nations [narody]. Millions and millions of people take a direct part in them. This is a fundamental conquest of socialism, its great service to mankind."⁵⁸

Now, /about relations which have developed between the socialist world and the liberated nations/.

In its very first moves, the Soviet Union and then the other socialist nations established with those nations relations of equality and mutually advantageous cooperation, which are helping to consolidate the independence of those nations and to strengthen their national economies.

"Solidarity with peoples who have thrown off the yoke of colonial dependence and set out on a path of independent development," K.Yu. Chernenko has stated, "has been and will continue to be one of the underlying principles of the foreign policy of our party and the Soviet State. This especially applies, of course, to peoples who are forced to repel attacks by the aggressive forces of imperialism, which creates extremely dangerous hotbeds of bloody violence and military conflagrations first in one and then another area of the world. To be on the side of the just cause of peoples, to take action to eliminate those hotbeds--today this is also an essential and important area of the struggle for lasting peace on earth. Our party's principled position in these matters is clear, pure and noble, and we shall steadfastly adhere to it."⁵⁹

In the mid-'70s the developing nations raised the question of creating a new international economic border, that is, the restructuring of international economic relations on a democratic basis, on principles of equality. This is historically legitimate. For example, as we have already stated, it is supported in the Prague Declaration of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact Nations (1983) and by nations of the socialist commonwealth. It is clear, however, that possibilities for realizing this plan are limited within certain boundaries. In fact, democratic international relations are totally contrary to the very essence of imperialism and its policy. And it is not surprising that the idea of a new international economic border meets with the most vigorous resistance on the part of finance capital and leading political forces of the Western World, particularly the USA.

It should be made absolutely clear, however, that if the liberated states have now been able to launch with such vigor a struggle to establish equal economic relations among all nations, this was only made possible by the fact that a world socialist economy exists and is developing. Even the setting of this kind of task would be absolutely impossible in a situation of universal domination by the capitalist economy.

And one more thing: With respect to ties between the capitalists and the developing nations, truly new world economic relations are a fairly problematic matter. However, /relations between the USSR and the other socialist nations, on the one hand, and the liberated states, on the other, are already new relations, truly equal and profoundly democratic/. By developing these relations, socialism is making an important contribution to the cause of social progress for the peoples of Asia and Africa, as well as Latin America.

Another extremely profound idea expressed by V.I. Lenin in December of 1920 would have to be mentioned here. "We are moving on to the area of economics," he said, "and we are proposing a positive program of development for the entire world and developing those prospects which are based on economic principles and which Russia regards not as an egotistical center destroying all other economies, the economies of other nations, as was the case in the past, but a Russia which proposes the restoration of the economy from the standpoint of the entire world.

"We are putting the question onto an anticapitalist plane. We say with our words and our actions that we are undertaking to structure the entire world on a practical economic foundation, and there can be no doubt that this is right.

"There can be no doubt that if we begin operating with the modern machines as we should, with the assistance of science we can immediately restore the entire world economy."⁶⁰

These words applied in great part to the time, of course, a time of restoration of Russia's war-devastated economy, a time of postwar ruin in the world economy. Lenin's basic idea, however--a new Russia, a socialist Russia undertaking to restructure the world on economic principles of equality--this idea is still valid and important and is taking on new meaning and new substance today. We have already traveled a considerable distance in the direction indicated by V.I. Lenin, and a significant part of world economic relations--relations among the socialist nations and then relations between them and the former colonial states--have already undergone far-reaching democratic reforms.

And finally, /about the establishment by the socialist nations of peaceful relations with states belonging to the opposite social system/.

As it develops its activity in the international arena, the working class of both the socialist and nonsocialist states proceed in this manner from perfectly specific, principled positions, which differ substantially from the positions held by the capitalist states.

In fact, the socialist states, like the communist parties and many groups of the workers' movement outside the communist parties, proceed from the premise that the existence of the two opposite social systems is an objective factor. The conflicts between them, which are of a social and ideological nature, are irreconcilable, and struggle is inevitable in this area. The socialist nations and the vanguard of the workers' movement of other states, however, feel that ideological disagreements should not be brought into the sphere of international relations. The struggle between the two systems should be conducted on the basis of peaceful coexistence among the states which are a part of them. Military confrontation between them should be avoided, primarily because such confrontation is highly dangerous for mankind, especially in the nuclear age.

The working class clearly proceeds from the premise that it does not need wars or military confrontations to achieve victory over capitalism in the world. Socialism is perfectly capable of winning under peaceful conditions. The communists consider the exporting of revolution in any form to be pointless, since

revolutionary reforms are accomplished in each nation by its own people as a result of the action of internal patterns of social and economic development resulting from the objectively conditioned intensification of conflicts within the capitalist system.

The bourgeois world, particularly the imperialist nations, do not have a common approach to this matter. The vast majority of states belonging to the capitalist world consider military confrontation today to be disastrous and attempt to avoid it, although their ruling circles regard socialism as an enemy against which an active struggle should be waged with all possible means except nuclear war.

Imperialism's most aggressive circles, particularly American imperialism, count precisely on the military resolution of conflicts between the two social systems or at any rate, feel that these conflicts require balancing on the brink of war. Such an approach is extremely dangerous for the fate of mankind. Because of this the working class of the socialist and the capitalist world feel that their prime task in the world arena consists precisely in combating those more aggressive forces, in isolating them, preventing military confrontation and averting a world war.

In our age the matter of preserving peace is the basic issue in the struggle being conducted in the world arena and the main element in the international activity of the workers' movement. With precisely this in mind, the CPSU arrived at the following conclusion on the substance of the main significance in the work of the communist movement, the vanguard of the working class, at its June 1983 plenum: "The communists have always been fighters against man's oppression and exploitation of man, and today they are also fighting for the preservation of human civilization, for man's right to life."⁶¹

Practically the entire world communist movement and a considerable part of the other groups of the working class are now organizing their work primarily around the need to accomplish this task of vital importance to the future of man.

It goes without saying that the struggle waged by socialism and the international working class to alter the nature of international relations, the struggle for peace among peoples, is not limited in the least to purely foreign policy and international political activities. Despite its great importance, these activities by themselves would produce little, if world socialism were not being constantly strengthened, if it did not build up its economic, political and military strength, and if the international working class, including the communist movement, did not increase its power.

It is the all-round process of alteration of the balance of power in favor of peace and social progress which is the material foundation for the changes which have occurred and which are occurring in the world. The building-up of this process and its further intensification have been and continue to be an important prerequisite for new victories by the working class in its struggle against imperialism, its struggle for peaceful relations among peoples--that is, in its class struggle for democratic reform of the system of international relations.

To summarize the results of the work performed by the socialist nations and the international working class in this struggle, we can say the following.

/In the first place/, truly new international relations based on the principles of proletarian, socialist internationalism have already been established over a considerable part of the planet.

/In the second place/, new relations based on the principles of real equality and mutual cooperation have also come about and been consolidated between the socialist nations and the developing nations.

/In the third place/, socialism and the international working class have achieved considerable success in the establishment of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems. The advances made in this area and materialized in the relaxation of international tensions in the '70s, which imperialism's aggressive circles would like to totally wipe out, have nonetheless demonstrated their vital and realistic nature. Most of the capitalist states do not wish to reject the basis for peaceful coexistence.

/In the fourth place/--and this is the quintessence, as it were, of all the changes which have occurred in this area--despite all the efforts of the forces of imperialism and war there is a real possibility of preventing a world war today. For the first time in history we are making a path leading to the elimination of future wars from the life of human society.

The Marxist-Leninist analysis of international relations, the positions of the working class on matters of foreign policy and the forms of proletarian struggle to democratize international relations is an invaluable tool of the international workers' movement, the communists and all of mankind today.

In fact, the conclusions of K. Marx and V.I. Lenin are the most important basis of the modern scientific theory of international relations. We know, of course, that numerous "theories" of international relations have been disseminated in the capitalist world. They do not coincide with the conclusions of Marxism-Leninism, however, but are in conflict with the latter. A substantial flaw in all those theories (although the "models" of international interaction or international conflicts produced by them have some extremely interesting approaches, which could be called pragmatic) lies in their constant digression from the most important thing, that which ultimately determines the course of events--that is, the class substance of modern international relations and their breakdown in specific stages of history. This accounts for the endless impasses encountered in their studies. It also accounts for the failures of bourgeois political science and its inability either to correctly understand what has occurred or to correctly foresee the future.

The Marxist-Leninist analysis, on the other hand, makes it possible to accomplish both of these tasks. It is essentially just this analysis which provides the theoretical platform for today's struggle against the threat of a thermonuclear world war and in the future--to eliminate world wars from the life of society entirely.

During the Great October Socialist Revolution the fate of social progress and the fate of the socialist revolution depended upon the struggle of our people to come through the war, a struggle for peace. During the last part of World War II social progress was determined by the degree to which fascism was defeated militarily. The destruction of fascism was the main prerequisite for social progress at that time. Today, with the existence of nuclear weapons with monstrous destructive power, the averting and prevention of a thermo-nuclear world war is the main prerequisite for progress.

The question of eliminating all military conflicts from the life of man can only be achieved as a result of a worldwide victory for socialism, of course. This is the prospect objectively dictated by the laws of history. Until this prospect becomes a reality, however, the international working class and its vanguard--the workers of the socialist nations and the communist and workers' parties--have served and continue to serve as the real defender--even more the saviour of universal peace--and the most determined champion for the democratizing of international relations, "...An alliance of the workers of all nations will ultimately irradicate all wars,"⁶² K. Marx maintained.

And the great revelations of Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels and Vladimir Il'ich Lenin are a reliable tool of the working class in this process. They point out the existing possibilities for the struggle. They demand responsibility. They open up new prospects for the workers' movement.

FOOTNOTES

1. V.I. Lenin, "Poln. sobr. soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 17, p 230.
2. K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 12, p 735.
3. We are not talking about a complete definition of international relations, of course. This is an extremely complex system, within which the states are only the main element. Read F. Burlatskiy, "Certain Questions of the Theory of International Relations," VOPROSY FILOSOFII, No 9, 1983, pp 39-42.
4. K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.", Vol 46, Part I, p 385.
5. Ibid., Vol 23, pp 337, 377.
6. Ibid., Vol 4, p 428.
7. Ibid., Vol 27, p 404.
8. V.I. Lenin, "Poln. sobr. soch.", Vol 42, p 174.
9. K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.", Vol 19, p 22.
10. Ibid., Vol 3, pp 337-338.
11. Ibid., Vol 46, Part I, p 386.

12. Ibid., p 395.
13. Ibid., Vol 23, p 247.
14. Ibid., Vol 46, Part I, p 7.
15. Ibid., Vol 46, Part II, p 384.
16. Ibid., Vol 4, pp 59-60.
17. Ibid., p 48.
18. Ibid., Vol 12, p 192.
19. Ibid., Vol 5, p 212.
20. Ibid., Vol 16, p 11.
21. Ibid., Vol 4, p 373.
22. Ibid., p 371.
23. Ibid., Vol 17, p 365.
24. Ibid., p 366.
25. V.I. Lenin, "Poln. sobr. soch.", Vol 27, p 305.
26. Ibid., Vol 28, p 312.
27. Ibid., Vol 41, p 47.
28. Ibid., Vol 17, p 187.
29. Ibid., Vol 26, p 1.
30. Ibid., Vol 22, p 136.
31. Ibid., Vol 30, p 133.
32. PRAVDA, 3 Mar 84.
33. K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.", Vol 16, p 11.
34. "Bor'ba za mir. Dokumenty trekh Internatsionalov" [The Peace Struggle: Documents From Three Internationals], Moscow, 1967, p 21.
35. K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.", Vol 16, p 11.
36. Ibid., Vol 33, p 109.

37. Ibid., Vol 31, p 71.
38. Ibid., Vol 4, p 373.
39. Ibid., Vol 16, pp 10-11.
40. "Mezhdunarodnoye rabocheye dvizheniye. Voprosy istorii i teorii" [The International Workers' Movement: Questions of History and Theory], Moscow, Vol 1, pp 588-599.
41. K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.", Vol 16, pp 372-373.
42. V.I. Lenin, "Poln. sobr. soch.", Vol 40, p 92.
43. K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.", Vol 4, p 300.
44. Ibid., Vol 17, p 5.
45. Ibid., Vol 22, p 461.
46. V.I. Lenin, "Poln. sobr. soch.", Vol 36, p 327.
47. Ibid., Vol 42, p 313.
48. "Materialy XXVI s"yezda KPSS" [26th CPSU Congress Materials], p 26.
49. Yu.V. Andropov, "Izbrannyye rechi i stat'i" [Selected Speeches and Articles], Moscow, 1983, p 215.
50. "Materialy vneocherednogo Plenuma Tsentral'nogo Komiteta KPSS, 13 fevralya 1984" [Materials From the Special Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, 13 February 1984], Moscow, 1984, pp 17-18.
51. V.I. Lenin, "Poln. sobr. soch.", Vol 45, p 360.
52. "Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya posle vtoroy mirovoy voyny" [International Relations Since World War II], Vol I, Moscow, 1962, p 26 (Introduction).
53. "The Struggle for Peace and Social Progress: Social and Philosophical Problems," VOPROSY FILOSOFII, No 1, 1984, p 14.
54. V.I. Lenin, "Poln. sobr. soch", Vol 26, p 166.
55. Ibid., Vol 30, p 74.
56. Yu.S. Novopashin, "On the Elaboration of the Theory of Development of the World System of Socialism and the New Type of International Relations," NAUCHNYY KOMMUNIZM, No 5, 1983, p 75.
57. Andropov, op. cit., p 295.

58. "Materialy XXVI..." op. cit., p 6.
59. "Materialy vneocherednogo..." op. cit., pp 18-19.
60. V.I. Lenin, "Poln. sobr. soch.", Vol 42, p 70.
61. "Plenum Tsentral'nogo Komiteta KPSS 14-15 iyunya 1983 goda. Stenograficheskiy otchet" [Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee of 14-15 February 1983. Stenographic Record], Moscow, 1983, p 126.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1984

11499

CSO: 1807/300

INTERNATIONAL

WOMEN IN THE ANTIWAR MOVEMENT OF THE EIGHTIES

Moscow RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYI MIR in Russian No 4, Jul-Aug 84 (signed to press 13 Jul 84) pp 55-60

[Article by Ye.P. Blinova: "Women in Antiwar Movement in 80's"]

[Excerpts] Women have been a significant element, perhaps the most dynamic element, in the powerful and multiform antiwar movement of the eighties. Completely aware of the growing danger of a thermonuclear disaster and firmly resolved to do everything possible to prevent it, they are vigorously joining in the struggle for peace, serving as both the initiators and the organizers of various actions by the defenders of peace. As participants in the antiwar movement--representatives of the most diverse ages and occupations, classes and strata of society, convictions and faiths--they are endeavoring to bring their own ideas and experience in life, their aspirations and their specific demands to the movement. Women and their organizations are also making an extremely valuable moral and practical contribution to the cause of protecting peace.

A collection of articles by prominent British public figures, scientists and journalists, issued in London in 1983 under the editorship of Birmingham University History Professor Dorothy Thompson and titled "Over Our Dead Bodies. Women Against the Bomb," contains an extensive body of factual material on the history of the nuclear arms race, on the political and ideological struggle surrounding that problem and on the mass protest movement which has developed in England in recent years against plans for preparing a nuclear war.

Those studying the antiwar movement are attempting to learn about its social and political makeup. Not only is the movement rapidly increasing in size in the 1980's, but its social framework is also being enlarged to an unprecedented degree by the addition of people representing practically all classes and strata of society, as well as all ideological and political trends. The Paris newspaper LE MONDE stated in October of 1983 that anyone who can subscribe to the slogan "Let us free the world of nuclear weapons" is considered a member of the movement. Remember that despite the great scope of the peace movement in the '50s and '60s, its champions were progressive-minded men and women from the working class, the middle strata and the intelligentsia, most of whom were under the influence of leftist parties and democratic organizations (members of the bourgeois and clerical groups most likely took part in the movement on a private basis). In the '80s the antiwar struggle is being joined by workers of all ages and

occupations, including women--working women and housewives, mothers of large families, pensioners, writers, journalists, scholars, members of parties and women who do not belong to a party, trade union workers and parliamentarians, atheists and believers. This enlargement of the social and political framework of the antimilitary movement demonstrates the fact that people are clearly aware of the military danger and the growing objection of the masses to the ruinous economic and social affects of the arms race.

These factors also existed during the "cold war". (The '50s and the beginning of the '60s), of course, but the second "cold war" period (the end of the '70s and the beginning of the '80s), as this period is referred to by British scholar Fred Halliday in the book "The Making Of The Second Cold War,"¹ is characterized by drastic exacerbation of the ideological confrontation and specifically, by "an erosion of the traditional ideological views of the Western society--especially on its class nature, its racial problems, equality of the sexes and the status of the national minorities": "The second cold war," he stresses, "is directly linked with a large-scale shift toward a more conservative policy in all areas.... In the area of social relations the shift toward conservatism means that the gains made by the labor unions, the women's movement and the movement of the national minorities in the '70s are being attacked by reducing allocations and passing the necessary laws."²

The geographic boundaries of the antiwar movement have also expanded in the '80s. Unlike the years past, when it was concentrated mainly in Europe and North America, it now also embraces the developing nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America, where hotbeds of international tensions have been created. Women's organizations of Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea are taking an active part in the campaign for the creation of a peace and security zone in Southeast Asia. The women of islands in the Pacific Ocean have joined the protest movement against the nuclear policy conducted by the USA, which proposes an enormous danger to that region. Women of the Near East are resolutely protesting Israel's barbarian aggression against Lebanon and the Palestinian people. The women of nations in Latin America and the Caribbean Basin demonstrating for peace in that region are closely linking their actions with a struggle for national independence, for the halting of the USA's aggressive policy and for democratic rights and liberties.

The peace advocates of Europe, more than half of whom are women, constitute the most militant and large-scale group of the worldwide antiwar movement, however. During World War II women of various nations, classes and strata of society, and representatives of various parties and organizations took part in the mass Resistance movement in the European nations which were the victims of fascist aggression. The unity achieved during the years of the antifascist Resistance served as the political and organizational foundation for further unification of the women of Europe and of the entire world against the threat of a nuclear war. Throughout all the postwar decades the women championing peace in Europe have consistently and persistently campaigned for disarmament, peace and cooperation on the continent and against the dangerous plans of the USA and NATO, which are attempting to turn Western Europe into an American military base.

In December of 1983 the antiwar movement in England, the FRG and Italy entered a new phase as a result of the deployment of first-strike American nuclear

missiles in those nations. Despite massive repression the antimissile protests by women's organizations are becoming increasingly persistent and aggressive as indicated by the slogan: "From Protest to Resistance!".³ Failing to achieve rejection of the missile deployment, the demonstrators are planning to concentrate on blocking actions to prevent the missiles from leaving the bases for planned exercises.

The women's antiwar movement in the USA is active and aggressive, although for certain geographic, historical and ideological reasons the ordinary Americans do not sense the danger of war as acutely as the Europeans, many of them are complacent and prepared to believe cock-and-bull stories about the possibility of a "limited" nuclear war and chances of surviving one, and so forth. Nonetheless, certain shifts have occurred in the public awareness in America in recent years, the people are beginning to soberly assess the situation which has developed, and dissatisfaction with White House policy, a desire for constructive talks with the USSR, and indignation against the deployment of nuclear missiles in Western Europe are growing there.

American women have demonstrated their hatred for aggression and military adventures more than once in past years. This occurred in the '60s when they made a perceptible contribution to the movement against the war in Vietnam, and it is occurring now, when, despite the persecution and the ideological and political disunity of their ranks, women's organizations in the USA have frequently been the initiators of numerous actions against the dangerous preparations for war, which are also dangerous for America. The "Women, fight for peace!" movement, the American section of the International Women's League for Peace and Freedom (IWLPF), "Women for Racial and Economic Equality" and others are the most active in this area.

The large-scale participation by American women in the million-strong demonstration in New York on 12 June 1982 and in the march by 400,000 people in Washington on 27 August 1983 clearly demonstrated the rise of the women's antiwar movement in the USA.⁴

American authorities have engaged in a real "hunt" for women supporters of peace. In an editorial of 6 October 1982 the WASHINGTON POST called the American section of the IWLPF and the "Women, Fight for Peace!" movement "henchmen of the Soviets." The newspaper received numerous objections to these absurd fabrications, under the pressure of which the editorial office was forced to publish a retraction and an apology a few days later.⁵

The women's antiwar movement of the '80s has been distinguished by the appearance of a large number of new organizations and groups. The "Women For Peace" movement was established as part of the "Struggle For Peace" movement in Italy at the beginning of the '80s, for example. It conducts antiwar activities in cooperation with other women's organizations in Italy. Clearly recognizing the true causes of international tensions, the participants in that movement take action against the military strategy of the USA and perform extensive explanatory work among the female population, especially at enterprises, and strive for cooperation with labor unions and women's organizations with diverse outlooks.⁶ The new women's antiwar groups also include the "Women For Survival" and "Women Against

Nuclear War" or "Peace Units," organized in the USA in the '80s, the latter including the wives of influential congressmen and financed by the Rockefeller Fund; the aforementioned "Women For Peace" organization in the Scandinavian nations, and new groups and movements in Holland, the FRG, France, Greece and Switzerland.

An extremely significant number of women in the capitalist nations are still under the ideological and propagandistic influence of aggressive circles, however, which are attempting to implant in the minds of the masses the myth of the "Soviet threat," which WIDF [Women's International Democratic Federation] President Freda Brown has called "the greatest lie of our time."⁷ Certain feminists and clerical women's organizations, while taking an active part in the struggle for peace, hold to the concept of "equal responsibility" of "the super powers" for the arms race, ignoring the peace policy and constructive peaceful initiatives of the USSR. A number of neofeminist organizations of the West, especially in the USA, attempt to bring to the antiwar movement the idea of struggling against militarism through the prism of "purely feminine" interests. The bourgeois feminist and pacifist movements include a broad spectrum of ideas and views on questions of international policy, including entirely sober assessments of that policy. This applies, for example, to the aforementioned and well known IWLPF, whose members recognize who is truly to blame for international tensions and the arms race. Edith Balantine, general secretary of the League, spoke at the World Congress of Women in Prague in October of 1981 against the U.S. strategy of limited nuclear warfare and presented her organization's demand that talks be started immediately between the USA and the USSR "on all issues creating obstacles to peace and disarmament." "It is up to the USA and its allies," she said. "The Soviet Union and other socialist nations have constantly expressed a desire to begin talks on all urgent matters. We cannot afford to pass up the slightest chance of achieving a political settlement, before the world is drawn into a new round of the arms race."⁸

The 22nd IWLPF Congress held in Goteborg in 1983 with the slogan "Women of Peace, We Shall Save the Planet!", adopted an international program of action for the organization for the period 1983-1986. It outlines specific actions calling for a halt to the arms race, for the establishment of nuclear-free zones, and for talks and cooperation among states for the sake of preserving peace. The League's plans include the strengthening of ties between the League and women's organizations of the socialist nations.

Women's organizations of the Socialist International demonstrate great interest in problems of protecting peace. This is a result of the general evolution of the foreign policy position of the Socialist International, which is disturbed by the deterioration of the international situation and is seeking ways to collaborate with other political forces.

The 11th Conference of the Socialist International Women (SIW), held in Madrid in 1980, appealed to participants in the Madrid Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe "to do everything possible to make the '80s a decade in which universal security will be achieved by political means and with a scaling-down of the arms race." The SIW promotes limitation of the arms race and the strengthening of detente. This organization condemns the doctrine of "limited

nuclear warfare" and devotes a great deal of attention to Soviet-American talks on strategic arms limitation.⁹

The resolution adopted at an SIW conference held in Hamburg in 1982 on International Women's Day, 8 March, contains the following statement: "We women of the entire world say 'no' to war. We do not accept this cynical playing with our lives. We demand that neither neutron bombs nor new Eurostrategic missiles be deployed in Europe and that existing nuclear weapons in Europe be gradually removed from that continent. We demand the establishment of nuclear-free zones whose status would be respected by the nuclear powers. We demand a halt to research in the field of weapons of mass destruction and other new weapons, as well as the production, the spread and deployment of such weapons."¹⁰

The Women's International Democratic Federation, the largest and the most influential organization, whose ranks include 135 national organizations from 117 capitalist, socialist and developing nations, is in the front ranks of the women's antiwar movement.¹¹ All of its work is imbued with thoughts of protecting peace, which are closely interwoven with a struggle for women's equality, national independence and a better future for the children. The WIDF approves and supports Soviet peace initiatives contained in the Peace Program for the '80s, which was adopted at the 26th CPSU Congress, and subsequent peace proposals of the USSR. Constantly striving for cooperation with other organizations, the Federation has managed to involve in the general democratic antiwar movement such liberal bourgeois and pacifists women's organizations as the International Women's Council, the International Women's Alliance, the International Federation of University-Educated Women, the aforementioned International Women's League for Peace and Freedom, and other international and national women's feminist, clerical and social democratic organizations.

In October of 1982 the WIDF appealed to women of the entire world to conduct a worldwide campaign of women's actions for peace and disarmament, the goal of which, as defined by WIDF President Freda Brown, would be "to prevent the destruction of our planet in the flames of a world nuclear conflagration."¹²

The WIDF and its national organizations made a large contribution to the preparations for and the conduct of the World Assembly "For Peace and Life and Against Nuclear War," held in Prague in 1983. Various meetings on matters of interest were held within the framework of the assembly, such as a meeting "On the Women's Attitude Toward Questions of Peace and the Danger of War." Despite a difference in the views of the participants in the debate, the meeting had a clearly defined antiwar and anti-imperialist orientation.

In December of 1983, as a result of the deployment of new American nuclear missiles begun in the FRG, England and Italy, the WIDF spoke in the name of millions of women on the planet and appealed to the heads of state and government of the USA and the Western European nations to listen to the voice of peoples and consider all of the consequences of that move. The Federation called upon all peace-loving forces to actively protest the further installation of Pershing 2 and cruise missile launchers and for the elimination of missiles already installed.¹³

U.N. organizations are playing a significant role in the effort to unite the women of all nations in a struggle for peace. The International Women's Year (1975) and the Women's Decade with the slogan "Equality, Development, Peace," proclaimed by the U.N., were designed to involve the world community in joint actions in that struggle. The U.N. World Conference on the Results of the Decade will be held in Nairobi, Kenya, in 1985. It will take place in a climate of intensified struggle against the threat of war, a struggle for national independence, democracy and peace. The Declaration on Women's Participation in the Furthering of International Peace and Cooperation, approved at the 37th Session of the U.N. General Assembly, is an incentive to step up the struggle for the accomplishment of these goals.

The number of women involved in the antiwar movement is increasing by the day, but even in the absence of official statistics it can be stated with certainty that they make up a relatively small part of the total female population in the capitalist nations. Most of the women are still prisoners to petty-minded attitudes and are apathetic in matters of international policy, and those who are interested in it do not always dare to become active. Prejudices about the women's secondary role in public and political life, which have been instilled in them for centuries, and discrimination practiced against women in labor and in public careers in the capitalist nations, not to mention the repression to which those fighting for peace are subjected, do not promote aware and active participation in the struggle by the broad masses of women. The number of women in political parties, labor unions, city governments and parliaments is proportionately far less than their numbers in the total and the gainfully employed populations of the capitalist nations. And this is where they could receive good schooling in political struggle. Women's participation in higher governing bodies at the national and international level, at which decisions are made which effect the fate of their own nations and other peoples (governments and U.N. organizations), is absolutely insignificant.

Despite the large number of difficult problems facing the antiwar movement, women and their organizations are making an increasingly important contribution to it, and at the present time, when the struggle between the forces of war and the forces of peace has entered the crucial phase, the majority of women are full of confidence that it is possible to prevent a nuclear catastrophe and to protect peace on our planet.

FOOTNOTES

1. F. Halliday, "The Making of the Second Cold War," London, 1983.
2. Ibid.
3. PRAVDA, 30 Nov 83.
4. POLITICAL AFFAIRS, Aug 82.
5. PAX ET LIBERTAS, Vol 47, No 4, Dec 82, p 5.
6. ZHENSHCHINY MIRA, No 1, 1983, pp 22-23.

7. ZHENSHCHINY MIRA, No 1, 1983, p 5.
8. PAX ET LIBERTAS, Vol 46, No 4, Dec 81, pp 6-7.
9. MATERIALY KSZh, Aug 83.
10. "Socialist International Women, Bulletin 2/82, Hamburg, 2 Mar 82, p 31.
11. MATERIALY KSZh, Feb 84, p 5.
12. ZHENSHCHINY MIRA, No 1, 1983, p 5; "Materials of the Bureau of the WIDF," Oct 82, Berlin.
13. PRAVDA, 7 Nov 83.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1984

11499

CSO: 1807/300

INTERNATIONAL

VARIOUS FORMS OF ECONOMIC CENTRALISM IN CEMA

Moscow RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNY MIR in Russian No 4, Jul-Aug 84 (signed to press 13 Jul 84) pp 61-69

[Article by O.R. Latsis: "Economic Centralism and Centralism of Management: Problems of Concordance (Thoughts on the Pages of Monographs in the Series 'Economics and Policy of the Foreign Socialist Nations')"]

[Excerpts] The series of monographs "Economics and Policy of the Socialist Nations," prepared by the Institute of Economics of the World Socialist System of the USSR Academy of Sciences, is making a definite contribution to the comprehensive understanding of the experience of the socialist nations and to the acquainting of Soviet readers with it. The "Nauka" publishers released the first books in this series in 1983.* The purpose of this article is not to review those books nor to provide a systematic survey of their contents. The diverse factual material presented by their authors is used for reflecting on a single subject—the principles for handling control of socialist production. Each of the monographs contains one chapter devoted to this subject.

The system and the methods used for planning and managing the economy have long been a subject of scientific, and not only scientific, debate in most of the socialist nations. Without this constant discussion it would be impossible to get to the bottom of the complex issues which contemporary economic life brings up, especially at the stage of conversion to intensive economic growth. Certain central questions to which the participants refer most frequently have become defined in the course of the discussion. The question of the ratio of the management functions of central agencies of control and those of the enterprises is just about the most important subject in the debate. We know of numerous statements by the proponents of "centralization" of control and planning and those of "decentralization," and we know their main arguments.

A position has taken shape in the dispute between the defenders of "centralization" and of "decentralization," in which, it appears, many representatives of both sides are prepared to come together. It maintains that there is no fatal incompatibility between the strengthening of centralized planning and control, on the one hand, and expansion of the economic independence and rights of the enterprises, on the other, that these are two sides of the same process and that both one and the other can and should be developed simultaneously.

*"Narodnaya Respublika Bolgariya" [People's Republic of Bulgaria], Moscow, 1983; "Vengerskaya Narodnaya Respublika" [Hungarian People's Republic], Moscow, 1983; "Germanskaya Demokraticheskaya Respublika" [German Democratic Republic], Moscow, 1983.

Unfortunately, we cannot take comfort just from the fact that such a "point of reconciliation" exists. It does not in and of itself assure a reliable answer from science to the complex questions raised by economic life. This is obvious just from the fact that although proclaiming this apparently common truth, supporters of the two positions can give it different substance. This is possible because in the general form cited above (and the matter frequently does not go beyond this general formulation), this reality is just as correct "in general" as it is empty of essence. It is not enough simply to proclaim it in general and on the whole. We must also, in the first place, at least remember which side (centralism or independence for the enterprises) is given priority in this dialectical interworking of contradictions and, in the second place, remember what the specific mechanism for this interworking is.

There would appear to be no disagreement relative to the first question, to be sure--again, in its most general form. The vast majority of the writers share the long-known position that the very nature of socialist ownership and the advantages it provides require that priority be given to centralized planning and control performed in the interest of the entire society. R.A. Belousov mentioned this once again quite recently in the article "Democratic Centralism and Economic Independence."* It is not just a matter of the socialist economy in general, however, but particularly the contemporary stage in its development, the state of intensification, which is bringing out new and previously unknown problems. With respect to the tasks involved in this stage it is especially important to determine how these two aspects are actually linked together in the management process. In our opinion, the mechanism of their interaction is such that the independence of an enterprise and its economic accountability for the entire process of expanded reproduction is not just an accepted element, but a useful and essential element of the socialist economic machinery. The independence, the rights and accountability of enterprises are an absolute condition for the implementation of centralism itself.

Thousands of facts from economic life show that the real conflict is not between centralized planning and the independence of enterprises, but between real centralism (which reflects the public interests) and formal centralism (which most frequently reflects group interests--departmental, localistic and others).

Real centralism is achieved when the economic processes are truly subordinated in a planned manner to the will of a single economic center, regardless of how it is achieved. Formal centralism is limited to the adoption of decisions not by enterprises, but by a ministry or some other agency of state control without learning whether the decisions are fulfilled or whether they assure the planned observance of proportionality in the interest of the entire society. And conversely, formal centralism is inherently distrustful of independent decisions by enterprises "at the site" and has no desire to learn whether those decisions conform to the deliberately selected goals for development of the entire national economy. Lenin actually warned us about the danger of such an approach, when he insisted that a distinction be made between real and formal socialization of production.**

* EKONOMIKA I ORGANIZATSIYA PROMYSHLENNOGO PROIZVODSTVA, No 1, 1984.

** V.I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 36, pp 171, 293-294.

Consequently, the real issue which we must resolve is not a choice between "centralization" and "decentralization" but the selection of reliable methods assuring the development of real centralism. It is useful to consider the experience of a number of fraternal nations, along with the varied experience of the USSR, in the search for the correct answer to this question.

Our stressing of the differences between economic centralization and centralism of control does not mean that these different and independent processes are not interlinked, of course. On the contrary, they are linked together very closely. This was demonstrated once again specifically by the latest experience of the GDR, which was written up in the aforementioned monographs.

Having passed through a number of stages, socialist centralization in the GDR's industry has been most clearly manifested in recent years in the creation of combines, which essentially became the all-embracing form of production organization as a result of the reorganization carried out during the period 1977-1980. The term "combine" covers associations of enterprises which differ greatly in the structure of their internal relations. The important thing, however, is that all of these are production associations and not administrative associations (which is what most of the now-dissolved associations of people's enterprises were).

The specific features of the "combine" form are graphically apparent when one considers the similarity and distinctions between the GDR's combines and the Soviet production and scientific production associations. The combines now serve as the main management nucleus of the GDR's industry, and therein lies their similarity to our associations. The combines have become the dominate elements more rapidly, however. They now provide practically all of the GDR's production output under centralized control, whereas the production and scientific production associations produce around half of the USSR's industrial output. The average combine in the GDR is several times larger than our average production association with respect to number of employees and production volume, although the largest Soviet associations such as ZIL, Uralmash and Magnitka greatly surpass the GDR's largest combines. Finally, the combine, like our association, embraces more than one link in the reproduction process. The most important distinction also lies in this area. Soviet associations embrace two links in that cycle (science, production), while the GDR's combines embrace the entire cycle (science, investment, production, sales), including in part sales on foreign markets.

The combines have their own research centers, at which around two thirds of the nation's scientific workers are concentrated. They also have their own construction organizations and perform a great deal of construction work themselves. With considerable development funds and extensive credit possibilities, the combines undertake extremely large investment projects without having to turn to the state budget for help. Finally, they have their own sales offices, and the largest combines also include foreign trade enterprises.

The creation of any one of the combines is a graphic example of the economic centralization carried out by the socialist state on the basis of national ownership of the means of production. Twenty-two people's enterprises located in nine of the nation's districts were included in the "7th of October" machine-tool combine, for example. They form a single, closely interwoven production

operation, in which 21,000 people are currently employed. A tire production combine includes six specialised production enterprises, a repair enterprise, a large research center and foreign trade enterprise and has a total of 11,000 employees. The "Schuhe" footwear combine has 90 enterprises and 42,000 workers.

It is perfectly apparent that this degree of centralization of industry's capital creates conditions conducive to the development of centralism of control, including direct administration. When all industry under central jurisdiction is concentrated in 132 combines, this provides a fine "view" of it from a single center. Was the reorganization not carried out with this objective in mind--convenience of administration? A study of the GDR's experience shows that it was not. As temptingly easy as it would be to directly indicate the goals (after all, it is not a matter of tens of thousands of objects of control, as in the case of Soviet industry, but only something over a hundred), the focus of general economic planning is not on volume indices for the operation of the combines and not on the specific list of actual products. Even such a traditionally centralized planning function as maintaining balance (responsibility for satisfying the nation's needs for a specific type of product) is assigned to the combines. Accordingly, the combines also handle the concluding of agreements for deliveries and sales of output. Normative indices, particularly the conservation of material outlays per unit of output and the conservation of live labor, are the central item in the general economic plan. Investment planning is also subordinated to these objectives. The combines themselves mainly decide what technical innovations are to be employed for fulfilling extremely heavy assignments in the area of resource conservation.

One might wonder why in this case economic centralization was carried out on such a large scale. After all, it is easy to make assignments based on overall economic quotas to a large number of small enterprises. The objective was obviously to assure that centralism did not remain simply a formal thing on paper, but that it be made effective. Legal enactments vesting the economic units with certain rights are not enough. They must also be provided with the material possibility for independently resolving the main problems pertaining to expanded reproduction. Only in this case would it be possible to actually accelerate scientific and technological progress to the maximum possible degree.

It was due to the scientific and technical strength of the combines that the GDR's industry could develop during the current five-year period without increasing the number of employees, without increasing the consumption of raw and processed materials and without increasing the number of energy carriers or even with a reduction in the latter. The intensive reproduction scheme is being realized almost entirely from these two growth factors (live labor and materials). This is still not true for fixed capital. Furthermore, an average annual growth rate of 4.5-5 percent is being achieved for industrial output. The results of national economic development are confirming the reliability of the interrelationship between the two processes: Centralism of control is used for strengthening economic centralization (the creation of the system of combines), and economic centralism is now reinforcing centralism of control and making it more real.

One might ask how the existence (or absence) of real centralism is verified--by the method of adopting and implementing decisions or by the result of their

realization. The historical experience of various nations has shown that the very same methods of effecting centralism produced success in certain situations and failure in others. It is obviously not a matter of the "technology" of centralism, but of its effectiveness. We know, for example, in the '70s most of the investments in Poland were made on the basis of direct decisions by central management departments or the provincial administrative agencies. Centralism of the departmental and localistic administrative type led to a loss of planned control of the investment process, however. The uncontrolled growth of capital investments was one of the main causes of the disproportions and destabilization of the economy. Conversely, skilfully executed regulations from a single center by means of economic quotas can insure an adequate degree of proportionality even with specific economic decisions turned over to the associations and enterprises.

This is indicated, among other things, by Hungary's experience, about which certain Hungarian authors, and in particularly bourgeois authors, have expressed numerous one-sided opinions. Ignoring the role of the plan in the nation's economy and interpreting improvement of the economic system as a strengthening of the "market" to the detriment of the plan. The Hungarian Socialist Workers Party has rebuffed those views, underscoring the fact that the planning of economic "regulators" is an organic part of planned control of the economy. Among other things, the system of specific economic standards is made up in accordance with the plan's objective and is ratified by the State Assembly (for the five-year period) or by the government (for each year) along with the plan and as an integral part of the latter. In this connection it would be interesting to trace the development of the real economic processes with such planning methods, using the same capital investments as the example.

Judging from the most general information, capital investments made at the decisions of the enterprises predominate in Hungarian practices. During the five-year period 1976-1980, for example, 55 percent of all the investments were made by enterprise decision, and only 45 percent by decision by state agencies. At first glance it would appear that centralism has lost first place to "local" decisions, at least in the choice of specific projects for the investments (the total volume of investments is specified in the state plan and passed on to the enterprises after being broken down into economic quotas). A more thorough analysis shows the following, however.

Central development programs approved by the government and supporting the key directions for scientific and technical progress and the development of priority branches have been in effect for a number of five-year periods now. There are five such programs for the current five-year period (for petrochemistry, the aluminum industry, electronic computers, electronics, and the production of medicines and plant protection agents). They now account for one fourth of the industrial capital investments, compared with 17-18 percent during the period 1971-1975. It is a particularly interesting fact, however, that funds from the state budget were used to cover no more than half of the allocations planned in accordance with the Central Programs in the '70s, and even less--only 10-11 percent in the current five-year period. The remainder is provided by the enterprises out of their own funds and consequently, at their own decision, voluntarily. They provide it because they find it advantageous for themselves

after studying alternatives for investing the funds and taking into account the interest rates set by the state for loans (differentiated according to their purpose) and the profitability of various capital investment alternatives. The fact that the enterprises make the decision themselves and spend money which they have earned themselves guarantees effectiveness for capital investments and rapid circulation of funds. The system of economic standards included in the plan assures that those objectives necessary to the society are given priority.

Naturally, such a system requires a certain caliber of planning work, constant attention to the real development of the economic processes, and the ability to rapidly respond to deviations and correct errors. The following is one example of this complex work.

In 1976 Hungary decided to do away with the existing, mandatory distribution of enterprise profits into the development fund and the profit sharing fund designated as material incentives for the workers. All of the profit remaining after the taxes have been paid now makes up a single incentive fund. The enterprise itself decides how to spend the funds. There is only one amendment: If the money is allocated for production development it is not additionally taxed, whereas a progressive tax is levied on sums spent for consumption.

The main intent of the new system was realized: The legal independence with economic restrictions functioned the way it was supposed to. Having been granted the freedom to make the decision, the enterprises were in no hurry to spend their profits on wage increases, and in general the basic proportions in the consumption branch were close to the planned proportions (a number of other regulators also being used to achieve this). The enterprises found themselves with more resources for financing capital investments, however, than the nation could have afforded in the foreign economic conditions existing at that time. The plan for volume of capital investments was exceeded for the nation as a whole, which was not an achievement but a shortcoming in the existing situation. The system of economic levers also includes the possibility of "fine tuning" of the machinery. The tax on enterprise profits was increased from 36 to 40 percent, and some time later to 45 percent. The investment possibilities of the enterprises were brought down to publicly acceptable limits. Centralized influence by means of economic "regulators" in the control of the investment process proved to be not only more reliable, but also perhaps more responsive and efficient, than the administrative distribution system, under which needed contraction of the investment front cannot always be achieved from one five-year period to another.

Bulgaria, which has been developing a new economic system since 1979, is a nation in which the voluntary association of enterprises has become widespread in recent years. Share and other associations, societies and collaborative undertakings set up by the enterprises on a contractual basis are one of the organizational forms used in the framework of this machinery. Differences in branch or departmental affiliation, or in the territorial distribution of the participating enterprises are not considered. The participants in the contractual associations retain complete independence. An enterprise may participate in several share associations at the same time.

The Bulgarian Industrial Management Association (BIKhA) is one of the nation's contractual associations. Production, scientific research and engineering and introduction organizations, higher educational institutions, scientific and technical and creative unions may be members under its charter. The BIKhA was established by 120 economic organizations in 1980. The number had grown to 800 by the spring of 1982, and district industrial management associations had been set up.

According to its charter the BIKhA is a "voluntary public economic organization, the purpose of which is to provide all-around assistance with the development of the economic creativity and activeness of the organizations belonging to it for purposes of enhancing production effectiveness and improving all of their work." The association has centers for economic and legal and strategic research and for the study of progressive foreign and domestic experience, as well as an economically self-supporting center for the introduction of scientific and technical achievements.

The Bulgarian Industrial Management Association has the capacity to organize extremely large-scale economic undertakings. A total of 52 small and medium specialized enterprises for the production of consumer goods in great demand were built with its financial and scientific and technical assistance during the first 2 years of its existence, for example. As a rule, they were built in less than a year and paid for themselves within 8 months on the average.

A study of the experience of real socialism shows that socialist centralism has extremely extensive and diverse possibilities and continues to acquire new tools. The selection of specific tools for specific purposes and conditions is determined by one thing--whether they have a real influence with respect to developing the national economy in the direction needed by the society and whether they raise the actual level of production socialization.

Processes are occurring in socialist economic integration which permit us to say that economic centralization and centralism of control have begun moving up to a new, international level. These processes are not occurring in the same way as those in the national economies, of course.

Economic centralization is sometimes accompanied by a direct international merging of "capital"--in the joint enterprises (Interlikhter, Erdenet, Khaldeks and others), for example, but it most frequently takes the form of actually unified international economic complexes. These complexes are made up of parts which remain the property of and under the control of the individual nations but function as a single whole (international pipeline systems and certain machine building and chemical complexes).

Centralism of control of the integration processes is also of a special nature. Unlike the capitalist integration groupings, CEMA has its own form of international centralism not accompanied by the creation of any sort of above-national agencies or functions. A new step was taken in its development when the economic policy of the CEMA nations began to be coordinated in areas involved in

mutual cooperation. The Economic Summit Conference held in Moscow in 1984 was a graphic example of such coordination. Not the subordination of certain nations to others, but the mutual interest of equal parties, serves as the reliable foundation for this coordination. Real production socialization is moving forward and increasingly acquiring new tools and forms.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1984

11499

CSO: 1807/300

INTERNATIONAL

CHILEAN WORKING CLASS ACTIVITIES EXAMINED

MOSCOW RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR in Russian No 4 Jul-Aug 84 (signed to press 13 Jul 84) pp 87-95

[Article by I.Ye. Rybalkin: The Chilean Working Class in the Vanguard of the Struggle Against the Fascist Dictatorship"]

[Excerpts] Since last year, 1983, there has been a growth of mass actions against the military fascist regime in Chile. The workers' movement has been the main force and taken the chief role in the development of the struggle against the hated dictatorship and for the restoration of a democratic system.

The starting point for the new phase in the struggle were decisions adopted on 21 April 1983 by the special congress of the Confederation of Copper Industry Workers (CCIW). The CCIW membership includes 26,000 blue-and-white-collar workers¹ of large copper industry enterprises, which form the basis of the Chilean economy. The workers employed at these enterprises are the backbone of the Chilean proletariat. The CCIW Congress was convened to discuss urgent questions pertaining to the economic situation of workers in the branch. Its decisions had a political cast, however.

As a sign of protest against government policy, which infringes upon the interest of the workers, the congress called for a 24-hour national strike on 11 May--"a general strike by all Chileans." The CCIW gave the following justification for its decision: "Our problem is not that we need one more or one less law. It is a matter of the entire system, which intends to stifle us by means of intimidation and repression and which is contrary to our way of life, because it was imposed upon us by force and deception.... If we do not struggle to change this situation, we are betraying our democratic and labor union principles.... The time has come to rise up in battle and say: "Enough!"² Not a single labor union organization had issued such a challenge to the Pinochet regime before.

Some of the old moderate labor union figures immediately assessed the CCIW's decision as hasty and resulting, they said, from "inadequate experience" on the part of the leaders of the copper workers. They were referring primarily to 30-year-old Rodolfo Segel, who was made chairman of the CCIW 2 months prior and had previously headed the labor union at a copper smelting plant in Calteones. It was not a matter of R. Segel's youth, however, but of his political evolution, which reflected the important changes occurring in the labor union movement under the influence of the dictatorship's antilabor policy.

R. Segel had taken part in a strike against the Popular Unity³ government at the plant in Caletones in 1973, and led a strike there in 1981, this time as a protest against the Pinochet regime's labor laws. R. Segel himself described his position in the following manner: "At one time I could sympathize with the actions of the military (that is, the coup of 1973--I.R.). The nation is now experiencing the most difficult hours in its history, however, and changes are absolutely essential. It is not just for us to receive beggarly, starvation wages, ...for more than a million to be out of work.... We are not criticizing the individual who governs, but the entire system which was imposed upon us in general, since it is hurting the workers and an enormous majority of the citizens."⁴

The CCIW's appeal for a national strike began to meet with broad response, which demonstrated that the dissatisfaction had built up to the point at which it could no longer be contained. Sensing a threat, the government began assembling troops, artillery and tanks at the centers of the copper industry. In order to avoid bloody confrontations, the CCIW decided to postpone the strike and conduct instead a National Protest Day. Underscoring the fact that the CCIW was advocating "a peaceful and active protest" against the repression and violence with which the government was responding to the justified demands of the workers, the conference declared: "We want to protest precisely against this unjust violence which has been ruthlessly brought down upon us. Against the violence, which consists not just of aggressive actions, arrests and exile from the nation, but is also manifested in the lack of bread and work, and the loss of our social gains, in the shortage of housing--in short, in the absence of freedom."⁵

The CCIW was supported by all of the largest labor union associations of blue- and white-collar workers as well as organizations of peasants, students, journalists, lawyers, engineers, actors, doctors and others. Industrial and agriculture entrepreneurs, and the owners of trucks, busses and taxis joined the movement.

Never before had the Pinochet government been opposed by such a broad social front. It could not prevent the National Protest Day from being held. Hundreds of thousands of Chileans took part in the most diverse antigovernment actions of 11 May 1983--demonstrations, limited strikes, work slowdowns, the boycotting of classes at educational institutions and so forth. This was the turning point in the development of the resistance movement against the dictatorship since the fascist coup of 1973.

Its importance grew even more, since at the height of the struggle there was an organizational consolidation of the unity of action achieved among various groups of blue- and white-collar workers. The National Workers' Directive Council (NWDC) was established on 21 May, again at the initiative of the CCIW. This was further confirmation of the proletarian nucleus's leading role. Along with the CCIW, it included all of the largest labor union organizations, which represented almost 100 percent of the organized blue- and white-collar workers. In addition to the labor unions, it was joined by around 50 various organizations of students, residents of workers' settlements, relatives of the victims of repression and so forth.⁶ R. Segel was elected chairman of the NWDC. The NWDC still does not make

up a unified labor union center, although it could serve as the basis for one. The NWDC serves as a coordinating body.

The NWDC proclaimed its main goal to be that of "restoring democracy and freedom to implement labor union laws."⁷ The NWDC's "Platform of Struggle" also included points such as the lifting of the state of emergency and censorship, the granting of access to the mass media for the opposition, the holding of parliamentary elections with the participation of all political elements, the implementation of steps to combat unemployment and improve the situation of the workers, and the restoration of labor laws in effect until 1973.

The founding of the National Labor Union Coordinating Committee (NLUCC) in June of 1978 was an important landmark in the further development of the Chilean labor union movement against the dictatorship. The NLUCC was formed out of the "group of seven." A significant development, however, was the fact that it was joined also by certain organizations which had initially been linked with the "group of ten"--a labor union of textile workers headed by M. Bustos--and the Federation of Metal Workers. Christian Democrat M. Bustos became chairman of the NLUCC, and communist A. Gusman was its general secretary. This demonstrated the unitary nature of the NLUCC, which turned out to be the most militant and most important labor union organization.⁸ The labor unions represented in the NLUCC set themselves the task of achieving unity of the workers, in order to begin "mobilizing social forces" for the restoration of democracy, and to work for a coalition which would reflect broad agreement on the part of national and popular forces opposed to the Pinochet dictatorship. As the immediate goal it was planned to compile a "General National List of Demands," "which would represent the aspirations of the Chilean workers."⁹

The government understood the threat posed by the NLUCC, which adhered to class positions. In October of 1978, as a result of the increased resistance to and criticism of its policy by the labor union organizations, it made the decision to dissolve the seven labor union federations, primarily those represented in the NLUCC (national federations of textile workers, metallurgists, miners and construction workers, and the [Rankil'] and Workers' and Peasants' Unity associations of agriculture workers), after which it announced the holding of elections to labor union organizations at private enterprises under supervision of the authorities. It also imposed a ban on the reelection of labor union officials in office and the nomination of those who had taken part in political activities during the preceeding 10 years.¹⁰ Its goal was essentially that of removing opponents or critics of the regime from the labor union leadership. These steps by the fascist junta did not prevent the growth of opposition in the labor union movement, however.

The period 1977-1980 was one of apparent economic "prosperity" for Chile. Total growth of gross domestic product (GDP) during that period was 7-9 percent and unemployment fell somewhat (to 17.2 percent).¹¹ This illusion of well-being was achieved with an enormous increase in the nation's foreign indebtedness and the implementation of a policy which went as far as possible toward eliminating the restrictions on the exploitation of the workers by the local financial oligarchy and foreign monopolies.

In 1979 the government approved a "labor plan" which established rigid controls on labor union activities and spread devisiveness among the labor union enterprises and on the branch level, permitting the organization of several labor union organizations at a single enterprise and several labor union associations in a single branch. Although the right to collective bargaining and strikes was formally recognized, terms were actually established which made it possible to emasculate this means of struggle by blue- and white-collar workers. Collective bargaining could only be conducted by the labor union organizations of enterprises, and not simultaenously, but at different times. The branch labor union federations were debarred from that process. The labor arbitration courts were abolished. The social security and medical services for the workers were turned over to private parties.¹²

The "labor plan" was condemned almost unanimously by the labor unions. The position of the NLUCC reflected determination and a clear understanding of the need for unity of action by the workers and all the democratic forces to defeat the antilabor and antipopular policy of the Pinochet dictatorship. The following statement by NLUCC Chairman M. Bustos illustrates this: "The main problem which the workers are now encountering is a lack of unity. It is perfectly acceptable for the workers to belong to different ideological and political trends and to have different views on the distant future, but it is absolutely inexcusable for our actions to be divided in the face of a regime which has for so long stubbornly trampled on the most elementary rights of absolutely all of us.... While we workers are divided and consequently, weakened, the military regime continues to impose with a heavy hand measures aimed at strengthening its model for society's organization, a model which conforms to the interests of only a handful of extremely powerful economic groups and is contrary to the interests of the workers and of the vast majority of Chileans." Among the measures mentioned by M. Bustos as being imposed by the dictatorship were the "labor plan" and the fascist constitution which went into effect in 1981 following its "approval" in a phony plebiscite. He called upon the people to prevent the accomplishment of the "attempt to turn our nation's history backward" and to counter the financial and economic plans and the regime which serves them with "the monolithic force of a united and fully mobilized labor union movement, with the force of a broad democratic movement."¹³

In the face of the offensive against the rights of the workers the NLUCC sent Pinochet the "National List of Demands" on 18 June 1981. Speaking for 12 national branch conferences and federations and a number of regional associations, as well as for 365 various labor union organizations, the NLUCC insisted that the workers be granted the right to participate in the development of that part of social, economic and institutional policy which effected their situation. Furthermore, it stated that "the present government is not honoring that right." The "National List" demanded the following: revelation of the fate of those who had been arrested by the authorities and had disappeared without a trace, and the committal for trial and punishment of those responsible for committing the crimes against them; recognition of the right of all Chileans to live in their homeland (that is, the right for exiles to return to the country); the revocation of those provisions in the constitution which vested Pinochet with absolute power and legalized despotism; immediate review of the economic policy, which was contrary to the national interests; an immediate, special overall raise in wages for blue- and white-collar workers and the

establishment of systematic increases in wages to keep pace with cost-of-living increases; an immediate halt to the reforming of the social security system; the lifting of restrictions for the workers and benefits for the bosses established by the "labor plan" and the restoration of labor union liberties and an effective right to strike and to conclude collective agreements; steps to solve the housing problem, and so forth.¹⁴ As M. Bustos correctly pointed out, the "National List of Demands" was essentially "a platform of struggle by all strata oppressed by the current regime."¹⁵

The government described the just demands put forth by the NLUCC as an act "inspired by international communism" and rejected them. Pressure began to be applied to the labor union organizations to force them to refuse to sign the "National List." Many other labor unions added their support to the NLUCC's demands, however. The Democratic Workers' Alliance (DWA), which was changed to the "group of ten"¹⁶ in April of 1981, and the labor union associations of state employees, employees of private institutions and railway workers closed ranks with the NLUCC.

Once again the dictatorship resorted to repression. The NLUCC was accused of violating the law on "internal state security" and of "usurping the right to represent the workers," and ten of its leaders were arrested and prosecuted. Eight of them were later placed on probation, to be sure, but M. Bustos and A. Gusman were held in prison for almost 6 months. When a group of prominent opposition public figures spoke out in defense of the arrested NLUCC leaders, the government exiled four of them, who belonged to various political trends, from the nation. The authorities took this step without delay in an attempt to prevent the coming together of the broad labor union and political opposition, which was taking shape.

Social repression was added to the political repression. In August of 1981 the fascist military regime thoroughly revised the labor laws. The legal standards which limited the power of the entrepreneurs to arbitrarily fire blue- and white-collar workers and to close enterprises were eliminated as a result. The nation's 8-hour workday was abolished. The length of the workday is now established in individual labor agreements. More than 40 decrees and laws which consolidated the economic gains achieved by the nation's workers as a whole or by individual groups over a period of several decades were totally or partially revoked.¹⁷

Although the NLUCC, as the most consistent and militant organization, was the main target of repression in the labor union movement, the labor law reform affected all workers and prompted all of the main labor union associations to unite for action, despite their ideological and political differences. The idea of uniting the blue- and white-collar workers and their organizations to defend their rights and demands was gaining strength.

Among those who began actively promoting such unity were the chairman of the National Association of State Employees and Tucapel Jimenez, vice chairman of the DWA. "We can no longer think in terms of a traditional labor union struggle," he said. "It is essential for the workers to unite for their own protection. We shall form a united front for the struggle. Only then will the workers be able to prevent the violation of their rights."¹⁸ Characteristically,

T. Jimenez expressed concern about a possible over-radicalization of the labor union movement. He stated that if they did not take action immediately, the masses, embittered by the deterioration of their situation, would force out the moderate leaders, of which he considered himself to be a member.¹⁹

T. Jimenez's call for unity met with a response and cost him his life. He was killed in February of 1982. There is information indicating that Pinochet's secret police, which had worked out a special plan for dealing with unsuitable labor union officials (the "Delta Plan"), had a part in his murder.²⁰

And so, some important changes took shape in Chile's workers' and labor union movement during the period 1981-1983: It entered a new phase characterized by stepped-up confrontation with the government, a growth of unitary trends, and a switch by the workers' organizations from protesting by means of statements and declarations to action and the drawing of the "lower strata" into the struggle. The actions against the dictatorial regime assumed a mass scale as a result. Despite the repression and the antilabor laws, a number of large strikes were held at copper and coal mines, at textile and footwear factories and among port and construction workers. These were not general strikes, but workers in other branches were demonstrating increasing solidarity with the strikers.

Despite the bans and the state of emergency, the labor unions and other opposition forces began protesting in the streets in the second half of 1982. "Hunger marches" took place in August in Santiago and other cities, and many thousands of people staged demonstrations "for bread, work and freedom" in December. The latter were organized by the NLUCC.

Once again, the government responded with repression. M. Bustos, the vice chairman of the NLUCC and E. Quevas, a communist and head of the Federation of Construction Workers, were exiled from the nation. This did not prevent further development of the struggle by the working class, however, which was carrying with it increasingly greater strata of the population. The demonstrations of 1981-1982 laid the groundwork for the transition of the working class's struggle and all of Chile's people with it, to a qualitatively new level. This was specifically manifested in decisions of the special congress of the Confederation of Copper Industry Workers, which was held on the first National Protest Day, and ultimately, in the creation of the NWDC.

This process was developing against a background of rapid deterioration of the workers' situation and intensification of the economic crisis which gripped the nation. A drastic drop in economic activity began in the second half of 1981. No trace was left of the apparent "prosperity." In 1982 the Chilean economy went into its deepest slump since the crisis of the '30s. The gross domestic product dropped by 14.3 percent in a year, and unemployment reached 27 percent of the workforce.²¹ The dictatorship's finance and economic policy had driven the nation over the edge. It is doubtful that anything needs to be added to the assessment made of the situation which developed in 1982 by Alexandro Jales, one of the officials in the Christian Democratic Party: "The only records of which the current regime can brag are the highest level of unemployment in Latin America and perhaps in the entire world, the largest per capita foreign debt in the world, the most rapid devastation of the productive forces in industry and agriculture, and human rights violations unprecedented for Chile."²²

The situation in the nation continued to deteriorate in 1983. Although the decline in the gross domestic product had slowed, the GDP still dropped by another 1.6 percent.²³ The nation had been set back by 20 years with respect to per capita gross product.²⁴ Unemployment approached 35 percent of the workforce in September of 1983. The real wages of blue- and white-collar workers dropped by 28.4 percent between August of 1981 and September of 1983.²⁵

To the extremely serious economic crisis was added a political crisis for the regime in 1983. The influence of the workers' and labor union movement and the political opposition upon each other was affecting the development of the internal political situation.

The first National Protest Day was followed by others--a total of seven in 1983, the last one on 27 October. The first two days of protest--11 May and 14 June--were organized by labor union associations. The arrest of R. Segel and other leaders of the CCIW as a result of the National Protest Day held in June prompted a universal strike of copper workers on 23 June, which was supported by certain other groups of workers. The strike had a clearly defined political cast. The demands put forth by the strikers included the establishment of periods for the "most rapid possible return to a truly democratic system," the immediate restoration of freedom of speech, the lifting of censorship, the return of political exiles, alteration of the economic policy, the freeing of arrested labor union leaders and so forth. The strike had to be halted on the 4th day, because the authorities took steps to prevent coordinated actions by the workers of various enterprises and branches and because the owners of trucks who had joined the strike entered into talks with the government. That strike is assessed in different ways. Some say that it was relatively successful, while others believe that it was far from successful. This difference in its assessment reflects both the strength and the weakness of the organized workers' movement, specifically, the fact that participation by the workers of industrial enterprises was inadequate because of their fear of being fired at a time of acute unemployment.

The response which the CCIW's call for a strike and then for a National Protest Day met with in the "lower strata" forced the moderate labor union leaders to alter their position. The leaders of the trade union associations of state employees (E. Flores), employees of private institutions (F. Muxica) and the Democratic Workers' Alliance (headed by E. Rios), which had initially declined to support the CCIW's decision to strike, did decide at the last moment to take part in the Protest Day, and following its success joined the NWDC.

The development of demonstrations by the workers and the consolidation of the labor union movement against the government stimulated activation of the political opposition. The third and subsequent National Protest Days were initiated not by the labor union associations and the NWDC, but by political opposition movements which had shaped up organizationally with the growth of resistance to the dictatorship.

It should be pointed out that the activation and organizational unification of the opposition political forces occurred despite the continuing ban on political activities. The opposition assumed such scope that the dictatorship was hesitant to attempt its total suppression, preferring to operate on a selective basis. The government wanted to halt the growing wave of the move against the

dictatorship, however, and split up the ranks of the opposition, and it endeavored to weaken the movement piecemeal. It lifted the state of emergency and censorship and permitted a small number of the political exiles to return to the nation. (A state of emergency was declared once again in the spring of 1984).

Antiunitary and anticommunist trends and an effort to keep the more consistent revolutionary forces outside the coalition against the dictatorship were the most powerful in the bourgeois political opposition. Two blocks therefore emerged in this opposition, unlike the labor union movement, which solidified under the aegis of the NWDC. The Democratic Alliance (DA) was formed in August of 1983, the People's Democratic Movement (PDM) in September.

The Christian Democratic Party (CDP), the largest of the bourgeois opposition parties and one which enjoyed considerable influence in the mass organizations, was the main participant in the Democratic Alliance. The Democratic Alliance also included republicans,²⁶ radicals, social democrats,²⁷ and a number of socialist groups. It was later joined also by one of the factions of the Workers' and Peasants' Party, MAPU (MOC).²⁸ The Democratic Alliance thus united various forces, from right-wing forces which had supported the fascist junta of the republicans in the past and the CDP, which was at the center of the political spectrum, to the Popular Radical Alliance, which had previously been a part of the left-wing coalition, and socialists and MOC factions.

The communists and the socialist party, which was headed by K. Almeida, were prevented from participating in the Alliance. This was due to the predominance in the bloc of the ideological and political positions held by the CDP, which considered it necessary to end the dictatorship by forming a transitional government and convening constituent assemblies but was against the use of force to achieve the goal and advocated peaceful means "as the only strategy capable of leading the national to democracy."²⁹ It announced its willingness to coordinate a program to serve as the basis for a future transitional government and a possible coalition government with the "democratic opposition" to counter the "opposition oriented toward violence." The CDP considered the communists to be among the latter. Because of this the CDP ruled out the possibility of a political alliance with the communists although it would accept joint actions with them on specific matters.³⁰

The CDP's orientation toward "peaceful methods of struggle" was reflected in the practical actions of the Christian Democrats with respect to conducting National Protest Days and restraining the intensity of the struggle. It also affected the positions taken by numerous members of the CDP who also headed labor unions. This was true of R. Segel, who made the following statement in May of 1983: "We must be 100 percent on the side of peaceful action and not strive for confrontation during a strike. Tomorrow they can strike me 20 times with a club, but I shall not lift a finger to defend myself. Let them strike me 21 times, if they wish."³¹

The unsound nature of this position has been increasingly revealed with each new wave of repression and violence on the part of the authorities. A considerable part of the rank-and-file labor union members who have experienced the brutality

of the police, reject it entirely. They believe that they should respond to violence with a rebuff and not "turn the other cheek."

The government has attempted and is continuing to use the line taken by the Democratic Alliance of "peaceful and orderly transition to democracy" and the presence of collaborative elements and anticommunists attitudes in the D.A. ranks to split up the opposition and prevent the creation of a united opposition front against the dictatorship. A "dialogue" with Pinochet's minister of the interior, into which leaders of the Democratic Alliance were drawn in August and September of last year, served this purpose. The "dialogue" only confirmed the groundlessness of illusions about the possibility of the regime's "democratic transformation," however. Representatives of the dictatorship rejected steps proposed by the Alliance for "a return to democracy," and the "dialogue" collapsed.

The communist and socialist parties are the main participants in the Popular Democratic Movement. To a certain extent the establishment of the PDM was a forced move necessitated by the fact that the political forces represented in it had been prevented from joining the Democratic Alliance. From the very beginning the PDM held unitary positions. While acknowledging that the creation of the Democratic Alliance was a very important initiative, it advocated broad democratic unity without any sort of illusions and agreement among all the opposition forces for the overthrow of the dictatorship.³² The immediate goals which the PDM set for itself--the removal of Pinochet and the creation of an interim government which would restore democratic freedoms and convene a constituent assembly--coincided with the goals put forth by the Democratic Alliance. This opened up possibilities for their joint action to eliminate the dictatorial regime. The realistic nature of this prospect was demonstrated by an enormous antigovernment meeting held on 18 November in Santiago jointly by the Democratic Alliance and the PDM. More than a million people took part in that demonstration.

"Today, especially after the meeting of 18 November...", the communist party of Chile concluded, "we can say that those in the opposition movement, which is headed in a common direction, are operating together, although the national democratic trend and the bourgeois or petty bourgeois trends engage in rivalry at times, but there is only one democratic solution for Chile: the departure of Pinochet, the creation of an interim government of national consent, elections for a constituent assembly to work out a new constitution.... There is no way out of the present situation which does not include as its prime condition the fulfillment of the three aforementioned points, which are supported both by the Democratic Alliance and the PDM, or by more than 90 percent of the nation's population."³³

During the activities conducted on the sixth National Protest Day in October of 1983, the PDM, which organized powerful mass demonstrations without the support of the Democratic Alliance, demonstrated its strength and the influence it enjoys, particularly in the workers' districts. The PDM is distinguished by its consistent anti-imperialist and antioligarchy position. It does not conceal the fact that its strategic objective to establish socialism and the achievement of this goal today are linked with the struggle for total democracy, for unity of the working class, all the leftist forces and the entire opposition. The PDM rejects "dialogue" with the fascist regime.

A meeting held in Santiago on 18 November, which called for Pinochet's retirement and restoration of the democratic system, was the culminating point of the movement against the dictatorship in 1983. For several months after that there were no more such powerful demonstrations or other mass actions approaching the national protest days in scale. The events which occurred presaged another acute confrontation between the dictatorship and the opposition, however.

The National Workers' Directive Council returned to the fore as an organizing force. A conference of representatives of national labor union confederations, federations and associations held in February of 1984 at the initiative of the NWDC announced that the workers "would tolerate no more delays in the establishment of a democratic regime in Chile" and unanimously approved a decision to hold a new National Protest Day on 27 March and then a universal national strike, the date for which would be set later. As R. Segel noted, the NWDC "has again assumed leadership of the social mobilization." He underscored the fact that the new actions would be effective, if they were joined by students, residents of the workers' settlements, peasants, individuals in the free professions, industrial entrepreneurs and democratic political parties.

Since both the PDM and the DA supported decisions of the labor union forum, R. Segel took practical steps in the name of the NWDC to unite the opposition front. At a meeting with leaders of the Democratic Alliance and the Popular Democratic Movement, held at the beginning of March and arranged by the NWDC chairman, agreement was reached on joint action to mobilize social forces to fight for the earliest possible restoration of democracy. The activities of the NWDC, which roused not only the blue- and white-collar workers in the labor unions, but the people as a whole, to resist the fascist regime, reflects the Chilean proletariat's role as the leading and uniting force in the struggle against the dictatorship. Its role was newly confirmed in mass May Day meetings held in Santiago and many other cities with antigovernment slogans in response to an appeal by the NWDC, in the ninth National Protest Day on 11 May 1984, and in subsequent efforts of the NWDC to coordinate the actions of all strata of the opposition, without exception, in order to put an end to the fascist military regime.

A new situation, more difficult for the Pinochet regime, is developing in Chile. He is opposed by the workers' and labor union movement, which has overcome its division to a perceptible degree, although not entirely, and by an extremely broad, organized political opposition. The dictatorship's isolation has grown. It has been forced to do more to defend itself to avoid being driven into a corner. Pinochet's situation is not yet critical. The dictatorship is still in a position to carry out retaliatory strikes and continues to resort to repression. Pinochet himself does not conceal his firm intention to remain in power at any cost, even threatening to "repeat 11 September," that is, to carry out bloody reprisals against his enemies.

Pinochet can behave in this way, although without his former confidence, because he retains the support of the army. This is because the collapse of the regime would mean that the higher command staff would be brought to accountability for their evil deeds. The frightening effect of neighboring Argentina's example is also a factor.

The Communist Party of Chile, which is a central element in the opposition, enjoys great influence in the popular masses. In its strategy it attaches great importance to the unity of all opposition forces and makes a consistent effort to see that the working class has the leading role in the people's struggle for the restoration of a democratic system and to channel their actions in the proper direction. This is evident not only in the work performed by the communists among the workers and other working strata and in practical steps to strengthen the labor unions and labor union unity, but also in the ideological and political work to achieve a clearer understanding of ways to overthrow the fascist dictatorship.

The communist party has clearly defined its position in response to attempts to split up the opposition between the proponents and the opponents of violence, and to appeals issued from the Democratic Alliance camp to the communists to specify which means of eliminating the dictatorship they support--the "Argentine" way--that is, by peaceful means, or the "Nicaraguan" way, that is, using armed force. It has stressed the fact that the path which the struggle will take does not depend upon anyone's desire, but is determined by the sum total of the objective and subjective circumstances and by the specific historical situation. It is therefore pointless to talk about choosing the "Argentine" or "Nicaraguan" way, just as it is to reject one or the other in advance.

Luis Corvalan, general secretary of the Communist Party of Chile, had the following to say about this problem: "Each people lays out its own path to liberation, opens up the way and builds it through struggle. Tyrannical regimes are not lasting. There are both common and distinguishing features in the downfall of all of them. Batista's dictatorship was overthrown in one way, the Somoza dictatorship in a different way, the Ethiopian Negus another way, and the Iranian shah in yet another. The specific form which the overthrow of the Pinochet fascist dictatorship will take is not yet clear. It is clear, however, that it will not collapse of its own. The people must overthrow it and set about implementing social reforms."³⁴

In fact, the people of Chile have chosen their own path to liberation, and their experience in traveling that path already contains certain unique elements. These include the national protest days, for example, and the role of the labor union organizations, particularly the NWDC, in mobilizing the masses for the struggle.

The Communist Party defends the people's right to rebel against tyranny. It rejects any kind of compromise and negotiations with the ruling regime, and believes that only a policy of popular disobedience, which includes and supports all types of militant actions and decisive acts in response to repression and oppression, no matter what form they take--open or underground, peaceful or violent--that only such a policy will make it possible to return the nation to a path of democracy and social progress. Furthermore, the Communist Party cautions against equating popular disobedience with a popular uprising. The former is a process of struggle which is already developing, while the latter is one of the forms, but certainly not the only one, into which that process can develop.³⁵

The events which are occurring confirm the correctness of the policy of popular disobedience proclaimed by the Chilean communists. In 1983 it acquired real

strength in a truly mass movement in which the proletariat is the uniting and the directing nucleus.

The immediate future will show whether Pinochet and his clique are in a position to maintain control over the situation in the nation. The outcome of the struggle underway will be determined to a crucial degree by whether the working class and its political and labor union organizations are capable of performing the avant-garde role and frustrating the intrigues of the dictatorship, which is taking advantage of antiunitary and compromising trends in the workers' and labor union movement to prevent unity of action by the workers and to split up the opposition, thereby averting the downfall of the antipopular regime.

FOOTNOTES

1. CHILE-AMERICA, Roma, No 80-81, 1982, p 28.
2. ANALISIS, Santiago, No 57, 1983, p 4.
3. CHILE-AMERICA, No 86-87, 1983, p 12.
4. HOY, Santiago, No 302, 1983, p 23.
5. CHILE-AMERICA, No 86-87, 1983, p 13.
6. Ibid., p 16.
7. Ibid., p 17.
8. According to certain data provided by it the trade unions had 1 million members (CHILE-AMERICA, No 46-47, 1978, p 22). This figure was apparently exaggerated, since the total number of trade union members in 1977 was less than 1 million (CHILE-AMERICA, No 76-77, 1982, p 37).
9. CHILE-AMERICA, No 72-73, 1981, p 23.
10. "Boletín informativo. Central Unica de Trabajadores de Chile. Comité Exterior" (henceforth, BI), R., Enero, 1982, p 46; CHILE-AMERICA, No 76-77, p 39.
11. CIEPLAN, p 155.
12. CHILE-AMERICA, No 74-75, 1981, Dossier, p 28.
13. CHILE-AMERICA, No 72-73, 1981, p 25.
14. Ibid., pp 29-36.
15. BI, Aug 81, p 11.

16. Although when the DWA was founded it was stated that it would act "against the existing capitalist model," its organizers rejected the class struggle, "regarded as a confrontation for purposes of destroying the other side." Christian Democrat E. Rios, chairman of the DWA, became the leader of the Confederation of Port Workers.
17. HOY, No 301, 1983, p 25; CHILE-AMERICA, No 72-73, 1981, pp 21-22.
18. CHILE-AMERICA, No 76-77, 1982, p 158.
19. Ibid.
20. BI, Dec 83, p 19.
21. CIEPLAN, p 155.
22. APSI, Santiago, 24 Sep 82.
23. BE, No 64, 1984, p 37.
24. CIEPLAN, pp 106-107; HOY, No 336, 1983, p 19.
25. BE, No 64, 1984, p 64; BE, No 62, 1983, p 57.
26. The Republican Party was formed by a "neofascist faction" which broke with the right-wing National Party, a supporter of the present regime, and calls for the restoration of a traditional bourgeois democracy.
27. The Social Democratic Party arose out of the former leftist Radical Party, which broke with the National Unity coalition in 1972.
28. The Workers' and Peasants' Party, MAPU (shortened to MOC), arose as a result of a split in the MAPU party ("Popular Action Unity Movement") in 1972.
29. CHILE-AMERICA, No 82-83, p 20.
30. CHILE-AMERICA, No 88-89, 1983, pp 32, 34; No 84-85, p 56.
31. HOY, No 302, 1983, p 23.
32. CHILE-AMERICA, No 88-89, 1983, pp 36-37.
33. BE, No 64, p 14.
34. Luis Corvalan, "Tres periodos de nuestra revolucionaria," Dresden, 1982, p 246.
35. BE, No 64, p 12.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1984

11499

CSO: 1807/300

INTERNATIONAL

BRAZILIAN ECONOMIC 'STRUCTURAL CRISES' EXAMINED

Moscow RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNYI MIR in Russian No 4, Jul-Aug 84 (signed to press 13 Jul 84) pp 96-111

[Article by A.P. Karavayev: "Aggravation of Structural Crisis and the Working People's Condition in Brazil"]

[Excerpts] For Brazil the postwar decades have been a period of rapid economic growth and simultaneously one of accelerated capitalist transformation of the social and economic structures. During the 30 years from 1950 to 1980 its gross domestic product, the absolute size of which is 8th in the capitalist world and first among the developing nations, increased 7.8-fold. With respect to average annual growth rate for GDP (gross domestic product), which was 7.1 percent, the nation lagged behind only 12 of the 125 developing states during that period--Hong Kong, South Korea, Saudi Arabia and Nigeria, for example.¹ Brazil's lag behind the developed capitalist nations with respect to per capita value of GDP was reduced somewhat--from 6.7-fold to 4.9-fold--during the period 1950-1980.² The Brazilian economy has taken on once and for all the features of an intricate, multibranch complex, with industry forming its nucleus.

The progress achieved has a diverse side, however. The spread of capitalist relations has led to further proletarianization of the population and contributed to an increase in massive unemployment. Contrasts in income distribution, as well as differences in the levels of development of individual regions and interbranch disproportions, have grown sharply. Nor have many complex problems inherited from the past been resolved. The system of latifundia has been preserved in land ownership, which bars the bulk of the rural population from the main means of production.³ Features of the single-commodity economy remain, and the system of foreign economic relations not only continues to reflect the nation's unequal status in international capitalist division of labor but also contributes to the continuation of significant inclusion of what V.I. Lenin described as the "lowest and worst"⁴ forms of capitalism and even precapitalist relations, which are retarding the development of productive forces.

The increased penetration of TNK (transnational corporations) and changes in the branch orientation of foreign investments are having a powerful deforming effect upon Brazil's economic and socioeconomic development. Prior to World War II the leading capitalist nations invested primarily in the area of trade, in banking, in transportation and electric power engineering, in the electricity and gas

supply system, telephone communications, and so forth, deliberately refraining from investing in the processing industry in order to reserve the Brazilian market for their own industrial output. The postwar upsurge of the nationalistic movement in the nation, however, the intensification of rivalry among the leading imperialist powers and an increase in protectionist tendencies in Brazil's foreign trade policy, caused by a drop in its foreign purchasing power, prompted a change of attitude toward plans for development of the national industry.

A certain shift occurred in foreign capital's policy, beginning in the mid-'50s. Transnational corporations, which had previously controlled the Brazilian market by means of exports because of high domestic prices for manufactured goods, began setting up branches in the nation. The influx of private foreign investments increased sharply. Entire industrial branches (primarily the motor vehicle, electrical engineering, electronics and chemical industries) had been created by the beginning of the '60s, mainly with foreign investments, and the bourgeoisie of the branches (both foreign and local), which controlled the more dynamic and modern branches of industry, was becoming the most influential group of the dominant class. The TNK branches were thus being more and more thoroughly integrated into the fabric of the Brazilian economy and the nation's foreign dependency took on a structure.

The above trends grew even stronger after the overthrow of the government in 1964, which brought a right-wing, authoritarian military regime to power, and under the influence of certain global changes in the development of the capitalist system as a whole. Specifically, the increased over-accumulation of capital in the imperialist centers contributed to an increase in the trend to transfer part of the production system controlled by the industrial monopolies to peripheral countries. The over-accumulation of capital was also manifested in an excessive offering of loan funds on the international finance market, which provided an additional stimulus to implement a strategy of development on credit. Many developing nations, particularly Brazil, followed this strategy in the '70s. According to our estimate, the total volume of direct foreign investments in the Brazilian economy (including unofficial investments) had reached 20-23 billion dollars by 1983, whereas it had only amounted to approximately 3.5 billion dollars at the beginning of the '60s.⁵ Still larger foreign investments began to be made in the form of credits and loans, however: The nation's foreign debt increased from 3.7 to 75 billion dollars, and to 93 billion dollars when short-term commitments are considered, between 1968 and 1983.⁶ While net foreign financing accounted for 11.5 percent of the sum total of capital investments in 1968, it amounted to 40.4 percent in 1974 and to 14.2 percent in 1980.⁷

Beginning in the second half of 1981 the economic situation was worsened by a drop in production. While Brazil's GDP grew by an average of 7 percent annually during the period 1974-1980, despite the intensification of crises, the absolute rate dropped to two percent in 1981, the first time in 50 years. The GDP experienced an insignificant growth in 1982, which certainly did not compensate for the previous year's drop, but production then began to fall again. According to existing estimates, it will reach approximately 10 percent of the 1980 level by 1985.

The set of problems produced by foreign financial and economic dependence have also grown far more acute. Specifically, foreign indebtedness had reached the critical level by 1982, and the nation found itself unable to muster on the international market financial resources adequate to meet its debts and other foreign currency commitments. The gap which developed in its balance of payments was partially covered with currency reserves from the central bank, but mainly by means of extremely short-term loans for which it was forced to turn to the U.S. Government, the Bank for International Settlement in Basel (which officially represents the central banks of the Western European nations) and to private international banks. An even greater amount of new financial resources, 25.5 billion dollars was needed to cover the commitments for 1983.⁸ All of this forced Brazil to officially appeal for assistance to the International Monetary Fund in November of 1982. The latter, in turn, imposed a stringent program of "regulation" of the economy upon the Brazilian government, in exchange for granting it a loan of 5.9 billion dollars and for serving as a intermediary in talks with other creditors. The nation was actually placed in international trusteeship. The main economic measures were now to be coordinated with the IMF, and if they were not approved or were not being satisfactorily fulfilled in the opinion of the fund's experts, the next portion of the agreed-upon loan would be frozen, and this would serve as a signal for other creditors: A red light would go on for Brazil over the entrance to the international finance market. In 1983 the IMF repeatedly resorted to this tactic in order to motivate the Brazilian authorities to step up their deflation policy, and particularly to make a more drastic cut in the workers' real wages than had already been done. The general plan for "adjusting" Brazil's accounts with its main creditors in 1983 was not coordinated until the national congress had ratified Law No. 2065 on 9 November 1983, which limited the nominal wage increase to only 87.5 percent of the official cost of living index, when wages are adjusted every 6 months.⁹ This means that real wages will be reduced by 12.5 percent every 6 months, and the cut will actually be greater due to the fact that the official cost of living index shows a lower rise in prices than is actually the case.

The decisions made under pressure from the IMF to reduce state investments and loans--specifically to cut financing for or even put on hold completely many industrial projects such as the "Great Carajas" (mining industry), the "Proalkool" program (the production of alcohol for automobile engines), the construction of a number of hydroelectric and atomic electric power plants, and so forth--as well as measures to reduce purchasing power on the domestic market, brought about an economic slump. Import restrictions, which created a shortage of many types of equipment, semifinished products and raw materials, and a deterioration of the financial situation of enterprises, caused, on the one hand, by a reduction in available loan funds and state subsidies and on the other, by an increase in taxes and interest rates on loans, were also contributing factors.

The drop in production, which initially effected mainly light industry and certain branches of heavy industry, spread to the production of durable consumer goods, machine building and construction. The incidence of bankruptcy increased. During the first half of 1983, 1,079 companies went bankrupt in the state of Rio de Janeiro alone. F. Matarazzo, one of the oldest private business groups, which had been a sort of symbol of Brazil's capitalist development for many decades, failed in July of 1983, along with a considerable number of less well-known

companies.¹¹ More and more groups of workers joined the ranks of the unemployed as a result of the drop in production and the increased incidence of bankruptcy.

The crisis which has befallen the nation and which embraces both the economic and the social and political areas, has apparently not reached its peak. Its further evolution and the possible complications are not entirely clear. No one has any doubt today, however, that the period of serious economic difficulties which the nation entered at the beginning of the '80s will be a long one. "This is the greatest crisis which we have ever experienced, and there are no prospects for a rapid solution," S. Gomez, former minister of industry and commerce, states.¹² Brazilian economist S.L. Martone maintains that the current crisis will be a drawn-out and serious one primarily because "unlike the depression of 1963-1967, which was produced by internal factors, it is aggravated by complex and delicate links with the international economic crisis."¹³ There are grave doubts about the current Brazilian government's ability to resolve the problems facing the nation by means of the economic policy developed and coordinated with the IMF. "The new financial assistance," Brazilian economist A.K. Braga Lembrujer believes, "will make it possible to make current payments on the debt but will not create the conditions for self-stimulating development.... The policy of strict conservation on which the IMF reached agreement with the government is more apt to produce an even deeper slump, with an insignificant drop in inflation, than to bring back the rapid development of the '70s."¹⁴ Furthermore, that policy is regarded by the vast majority of Brazilian public opinion as openly capitulatory and is meeting with growing resistance by the parliamentary and nonparliamentary opposition.

The political situation has become far more acute since the beginning of 1984. While in the final months of last year political tensions were produced primarily by the struggle waged by the masses against various government plans for reducing real wages, a powerful movement for constitution reform by an extensive bloc of opposition forces has now developed in the nation. Its ultimate goal is to remove the political regime which came into being as a result of the government's overthrow in 1964 from power as rapidly as possible. The opposition demands that the current indirect system whereby heads of state are elected by an electoral board at which the government has a majority be replaced with direct and universal voting, thereby assuring that a political figure independent of the regime is elected in the forthcoming presidential election on 15 January 1985. This plan has extremely broad support. According to surveys, it is supported by 95 percent of the potential voters. Dozens of mass political demonstrations were held in the nation between January and April of 1984 in support of the demand for the direct election of a president. They included giant demonstrations in Rio de Janeiro on 10 April and Sao Paulo on 17 April, which were the largest in Brazil's entire history and in which more than 2 million took part.

The crisis experienced by Brazil is recreating the crisis situation of the first half of the '60s, but now at a new level in the spiral of social development. The economic slump, like that of two decades ago, was preceded by an economic boom; a rise in inflation produced a slide toward a depression; and the adjustment of the foreign debt became one of the most difficult problems and a factor in the intensification of political tensions. The current crisis is incomparably deeper and more destructive, however, since the problems and conflicts

produced by the development of capitalism and by imperialist dependency have taken on new dimensions at the contemporary stage of the structural crisis. For example, while the nation's GDP has increased by 3.1-fold and average productivity of public labor has grown by approximately 60 percent since the mid-'60s, real wages for the vast majority of Brazilian workers have remained practically unchanged or have even dropped. Financial commitments with respect to liquidating foreign indebtedness have grown 26-fold nominally and more than 9-fold when adjusted for international inflation during that period. And so, the economic and social conflicts which the strategy of capitalist modernization was designed to overcome are now even more acute, as demonstrated particularly by the scale of the current crisis. All of this apparently foreshadows continuing intensification of the struggle for various alternatives for resolving Brazil's extremely important national problems.

FOOTNOTES

1. CONJUNTURA ECONOMICA, Rio de Janeiro, No 12, 1973, supplement, pp 3,5; "Anuario Estatistico do Brasil," 1981, p 758; "Razvivayushchiyesya strany: ekonomicheskii rost i sotsial'nyy progress" [The Developing Nations: Economic Growth and Social Progress], edited by V.L. Sheynis and A.Ya. El'yanov, Moscow, 1983, pp 604, 605.
2. Calculated from "Statistical Abstract of Latin America," Vol 22, Los Angeles, 1983, p 280; "Razvivayushchiyesya..." op. cit., p 70; NOTAS SOBRE LA ECONOMIA Y EL DESARROLLO DE AMERICA LATINA, No 373, 1983, p 14.
3. The concentration of land in large estates has even increased. While farms of 500 or more hectares of land accounted for 50.8 percent of the land area in 1970, the figure was 56.7 percent in 1980. The portion of small farms of up to 10 hectares in cultivation fell from 3.1 to 2.4 percent during that decade ("Anuario Estatistico do Brasil," 1977, p 304; "IX Recenseamento geral do Brasil--1980. Sinopse preliminar do censo agropecuario," Rio de Janeiro, Vol 2, 1982, p 4).
4. V.I. Lenin, "Poln. sobr. soch.", [Complete Collected Works], Vol 3, p 597.
5. A. Moura, "O Projeto Sobre Capitais Estrangeiros," ESTUDOS SOCIAIS, Jun 62, p 15.
6. NOTAS SOBRE LA ECONOMIA Y EL DESARROLLO DE AMERICA LATINA, No 387-388, 1983, p 14; INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, 27 Nov 84.
7. Calculated with the formula: amount of net foreign financing equals the deficit in the balance of payments for current operations + changes in gold reserves.
8. CONJUNTURA ECONOMICA, No 2, 1983, pp 150-155; BOLSA Review, May 83, p 44.
9. QUARTERLY ECONOMIC REVIEW OF BRAZIL, No 4, 1983, p 7.
10. O ESTADO DE SAO PAULO, 27 Aug 83.

11. Ibid.
 12. BANAS, 12-19 Sep 78, p 5.
 13. APEC. A Economia Brasileira..., p 177.
 14. INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, 21 Oct 83.
- COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1984

11499
CSO: 1807/300

INTERNATIONAL

INSTITUTE DISCUSSION OF WESTERN ECONOMIC CRISIS

Moscow RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNYI MIR in Russian No 4, Jul-Aug 84 (signed to press 13 Jul 84) pp 150-156

[Report by A.-V. Karlsen and V.K. Kolomiyets: "The Present Stage of Crisis Development of Capitalism and the Struggle of the Proletariat"]

[Text] The intensification of capitalism's general crisis is one of the key problems being focused upon by the Marxist researchers. The characteristics of its contemporary form in the industrially developed capitalist nations were the subject of discussion at a meeting of the Section for Problems of the Communist and Workers' Movement in the Capitalist World of the International Workers' Movement Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Professor A.A. Galkin, doctor of historical sciences and head of the department, presented a report on "The Specific Features of the Economic and the Sociopolitical Situation in the Zone of Developed Capitalism." While noting that the current phase in the intensification of capitalism's general crisis is characterized by the same features which have distinguished it from the time it came into being, the speaker directed attention to the specific features of the current crisis developments, particularly in the economic area.

In A.A. Galkin's opinion, the crisis in world capitalist division of labor is manifested first of all in the fact that its contemporary capitalist forms (transnational corporations and state monopolistic integration) do not conform to the objective needs for the internationalization of productive forces; in the second place, in a reduction in the capacity of the centers of capitalist development to provide themselves with a supply of cheap raw materials and energy, on the one hand, and the necessary sales of output volume, on the other, using the tested means of economic and foreign economic pressure; and in the third place, in a growing confrontation by the three main centers of contemporary imperialism--the United States, Western Europe and Japan--as well as in the clear prospects for the formation of a new concentration of financial and industrial might based on an alliance of the ruling circles of certain of the developing nations which produce oil and export raw materials, and the transnational corporations which have moved into those nations.

The reduction in the effectiveness of those mechanisms designed to regulate state monopolistic development is another manifestation of the crisis processes. This is reflected in the fact that controlled inflation has become

barely restrained, even uncontrolled, the equilibrium of capitalism's international currency and finance system has broken down, the stimulating effect of state investments upon industrial production rates has weakened, the effect from the manipulating of discount rates has been reduced, and indicative planning based on the above mechanisms has been unable to prevent extensive disproportions in branch development.

The speaker also discussed that aspect of the crisis pertaining to the process of the capitalist way of introducing the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution into production. Scientific knowledge was accumulated in the course of developing the scientific and technical revolution during the first postwar decades, and technical developments were produced which opened the way to a fundamental restructuring of the production processes. Nonetheless, economic growth, which was directed by profit considerations, was still oriented toward the wasteful forms of production for a long time and ignored the real balance of natural resources and the capacity of the environment. The interruption of the energy and raw materials crisis put an end to the idea that the supply of energy and raw materials on which the widespread technology was based was practically inexhaustible. The cyclical crisis of 1974-1975 and especially those occurring during the period of 1980-1983 provided an additional powerful stimulus to switch to forms of production which would not only reduce capital's outlays of energy and raw materials, but would also assure an additional reduction in production costs as a result of conservation in the production process itself, primarily by reducing outlays of labor which were expensive from capital's standpoint.

The switch to the new technological and technical basis created pressure in the area of employment, as a result of which capitalism was forced for the first time in many decades to deal with a phenomenon which has come to be known as the employment crisis.

The main factor underlying the crisis processes is a reduction in the variable portion of capital made possible as a result of rapid development of productive forces and consequently, a conservation of labor resulting from production's conversion to the new technological and technical basis. This factor initially occupied a position of subordination among the causes of mass unemployment. By the end of the '70s, however, it had begun determining the main employment dynamics and consequently, the reverse side--unemployment. This was brought about to a significant degree by the fact that by that time the change in capital's structure as a result of the continuing reduction of the variable portion had spread extensively to the nonproduction area, in which a large part of the hired labor was concentrated. The progressing conservation of live labor led to a situation in which that sphere, which for a number of years had served as a reservoir absorbing the workers forced out of other areas of production, became a supplier of now "surplus" workers on the labor market.

In A.A. Galkin's opinion, the present process of workers being forced out of public production will continue on a rising scale, regardless of any changes in the current factors causing the unemployment--the state of the market, the migration of capital and demographic processes.

The growth in the number of workers forced out of production is accompanied by a qualitative change in their makeup. The bulk of the unemployed were formerly older people, people with a limited ability to work, people with inferior or totally obsolete skills, and people who were incapable of retraining or did not desire to be retrained. The specific portion of the declassé elements was relatively large. Present day unemployment has spread to an entirely different type of workers. These are youth with a high level of education, who did not have the opportunity to enter the production process after completing their training, on the one hand, and on the other, semiskilled or skilled workers in the common occupations, the need for which is rapidly decreasing. A considerable portion of the individuals out of work are people in the occupations involving simple or complex nonphysical labor. Unlike the old type of unemployed, they all have a developed structure of needs, a high level of social expectations and social activeness. While previously unemployment was most frequently temporary or short-term, it has taken lasting forms in the '80s, with all the resultant moral and social costs.

The economic and social situation which arose during the second half of the '70s and has continued to develop in the '80s, A.A. Galkin stressed, has made significant changes in the social-psychological and the ideological climate, as well as in the consciousness of individual social groups. A progressive trend toward marginalization of the consciousness of a significant part of the population is a specific phenomenon produced by the intensification of the economic and social situation which has developed in the capitalist world.

The processes which are occurring have intensified an internal rejection of the strategy of social maneuvering which was employed at the previous stage, a rejection widespread in the dominant classes but buried for a long time in the depths of their consciousness. This accounts for the attempt to use the altered economic situation, particularly the situation in the labor markets, to take social revenge. In the political area a growing lack of confidence in the effectiveness of existing state and social institutions as a tool for controlling and manipulating the masses, on the one hand, and the growing disappointment of the masses with the results of the functioning of those institutions, on the other, have increased a tendency on the part of influential factions in the dominant class to begin reconsidering the preferred strategy for retaining and strengthening their power. The main trend in this reconsideration is a movement toward the more extensive and active use of means of undisguised coercion and force.

The situation which has developed in the nations of developed capitalism is opening up new possibilities for consolidating and increasing the influence of the workers' movement, of leftist and democratic forces. The latter are encountering serious difficulties, however, which will only be overcome with great effort.

In the first place, the scientific and technical revolution is having a growing influence upon the traditional mass base, the factory and plant proletariat, upon which the workers' organizations, particularly the communist parties, have relied until now. The new and growing groups of the working class still have to be won over, since they are still linked politically with the so-called moderates--the reformists and those to the right of them. In the second place,

the confusion and disorientation of a significant part of the working class, caused by economic difficulties, the employment crisis and the breakdown of previous ideas about ways to develop the society, are now creating fertile soil for right-wing forces attempting to take advantage of the existing situation to enter the ranks of the working class and misuse its dissatisfaction. In the third place, the emergence of a mass category of the capable and politically active population forced out of the production process raises a question about the policy of the workers' parties toward this group of the socially restricted population and about methods of representing its interests, because otherwise it may find itself the object of manipulations on the part of either leftist or right-wing radical forces. In the fourth place, unfortunately, there is no convincing alternative to all of this which is clear to the mass awareness. This accounts for the extremely widespread ideological interference, which opens up an additional field of action for right-wing forces.

A.A. Galkin stated in conclusion that the working class and the workers' movement in the industrially developed capitalist nations are now at an important stage. They possess every possibility not simply for repelling the next attack by forces who want social revenge, but even for dealing them a decisive defeat. The realization of these possibilities, however, will obviously require serious political decisions and significant reorganization.

The economic aspects of capitalism's contemporary crisis development was one of the central themes of the subsequent discussion. Among other things, Candidate of Economic Sciences G.G. Pirogov suggested that the term "structural crisis" be precisely defined for describing the present phase of the crisis in the industrially developed capitalist nations. In his opinion, this term could be used to describe a state of the social and economic system in which:

- a. development cannot continue on the former structural basis for a number of reasons which are to a significant degree external to the system;
- b. the system has a certain scientific and technical capability permitting it to effect a structural reorganization;
- c. the reorganization is carried out within the framework of one or another social formation and is limited to the replacement of the production model; and the public institutions within the system do not provide for the purposive, planned implementation of that reorganization;
- d. the outcome of the reorganization depends upon the system's ability to cope with the social consequences of the reorganization, that is, upon the system's social potential.

Speaking of the term "structural crisis," Doctor of Historical Sciences I.S. Yazhborovskaya indicated the need to relate the concepts "structure" "systemic, structural approach" to the conceptual tool of Marxist-Leninist philosophical science. In her opinion, it would be worthwhile to take these methodological prerequisites into account for looking at the pressing problems of the developed capitalist nations from the standpoint of the state and dynamics of the structure of the capitalist society as a whole and of the individual types of public relations and the change in the level of organization of contemporary capitalism's

systems. Specifically, it would be useful to compare the present demands of laws underlying the structure and those underlying the functioning and to analyze the discrepancies which have arisen between them; to reveal the reorganization or the trend toward the reorganization of structural connections conforming to the change in the structural elements, and the development leading toward a transition to the higher types of connections. I.S. Yazhborovskaya stressed the fact that the sum total of these processes can only be called a "structural crisis" in a very hypothetical sense. This term can only be applied to the first phase, since it is precisely the deformations which appear most clearly in that phase, while the actual process of reorganization is considerably more extensive and opens up paths of continued development.

Doctor of Historical Sciences R.Ya. Yevzerov pointed out certain elements which will apparently intensify the conflicting nature of capitalism's technical and economic development, its material base and the entire set of relations and superstructures associated with it. We need to bear in mind the extremely great dissimilarity of present day capitalist production even in the more industrially developed capitalist nations and the market's development primarily with the means of production. Its contradictory nature is also inseparable from the continuing, powerful development of military production, the general militarization of the economy and the resulting uncontrolled growth of state budget deficits. R.Ya. Yevzerov noted the variation in meaning attached to this term. This terminological ambiguity can be explained and will apparently exist for a long time yet.

Along with the preliminary work on the basic conceptual tool as applicable to the current phase of capitalism's crisis development, as well as the methodology and the methods for studying it, the participants in the discussion also dealt with its specific historical features. Candidate of Historical Sciences Yu.P. Mador, for example, raised the issue of the historical place of the contemporary phase in capitalism's crisis development. There have been eras in the history of human society in which it has met with energy crises of a fundamental nature, which essentially made it necessary to seek a new source and method of deriving the means of existence. The current crisis is distinguished by the fact that non-renewable sources of energy and raw materials are on the verge of being exhausted. The contemporary structural reorganization of the capitalist economy and its social effects are a direct response to the energy situation in the world. The technological and production advances of today, however, are not merely the next phase of the scientific and technological revolution. In view of the energy situation, it can be said that this is a forced and greatly one-sided adaptation--within the framework of the possibilities and the natural laws of the capitalist economy--to a future age in which mankind will live in a world poor in fossilized raw materials and nonrenewable sources of energy.

Candidate of Historical Sciences K.C. Kholodkovskiy devoted his talk to a historical comparison of the current intensification of the crisis processes with the previous crisis period started by the "great crisis" of 1929-1933.

The social and the sociopsychological effects of the contemporary phase and capitalism's crisis development received a great deal of attention in the discussion (using both regional and national data).

Candidate of Historical Sciences A.M. Salmin's talk dealt with the effect of the current crisis upon the process of (marginalization) in France's situation. It has the following main aspects:

the legitimized periphery of the active society is being expanded;

that group of people on the border between economic inactivity and activeness and especially vulnerable to unemployment is increasing sharply;

various types of temporary employment which erase the more or less clearly defined border between the nucleus and the periphery of the active society are rapidly becoming widespread, simultaneously reducing and destabilizing the nucleus itself;

a considerable group of people who have been without work for a long time is emerging.

Candidate of Historical Sciences S.V. Mikhaylov noted that new technology is not the only factor in the employment crisis, although it is playing a very important role. A study of the problem of the new technology's labor-saving effect in Great Britain has shown that it is paralleled by such labor market destabilizers as cyclical crises, the trend of moving enterprises to other nations with an abundant and inexpensive workforce, the effects of the competitive struggle in the capitalist world and the large-scale penetration of foreign products into the domestic market. The circumstances having a negative effect upon employment in Great Britain include a drastic shift in economic strategy, the intensifying militaristic trends, a reduction in the real incomes of a growing section of the population and a corresponding drop in consumer demand, which is endangering additional jobs.

Doctor of Historical Sciences G.G. Diligenskiy noted that the crisis turn in capitalist development has led to the emergence and intensification of a gap between the motivational and cognitive structures in the mass awareness, thereby intensifying the internal contradiction of both the structures. During the very first phase of the crisis, in the middle and the second half of the '70s, the weakened position of the workers' movement in a number of nations, caused by the deterioration of conditions on the labor market and fear caused by an uncertain future intensified tendencies toward passivity and accommodation in the awareness of part of the working masses. Imperical studies have shown that the new demands and values still have a role in the system of concepts functioning in the masses, but their motivating function in social and political behavior has been weakened to a certain degree. The increased difficulty of realizing them in the crisis situation has been a factor in this.

Candidate of Historical Sciences M.I. Novinskaya depicted the social and psychological shifts produced in the capitalist nations by modern development. The transfer of types of awareness marginal for the bourgeois society from the level of the elite to that of the masses is a characteristic of the current crisis in capitalism's spiritual values, which began with the youth protests of the '60s. The process of shaping alternative value models of mass awareness is marked by a denial of the bourgeois way of life and way of thinking and the emergence of a

need for other reference values. The development of this process is bringing to the center of public attention the problems of goals and priorities for social and economic development, consumption as a way of life, alienation of the individual and individual self-fulfillment, the "quality of life," ecology and social egalitarianism.

M.I. Novinskaya noted that the evolution of the work epic is one characteristic example of the massive spread of the "new values." At the present time there are three basic models of attitudes toward labor in the capitalist society; work is the sacred duty of every individual, regardless of its nature; work is an area of self-fulfillment for the individual, which places greater demands upon the nature of the work; and finally, denial of the significance of publicly useful labor as a moral-value element of the individual's vital functioning. Until recently only the first model of the work epic was accepted as a standard in the bourgeois society. Although the others actually existed, they were either beyond the comprehension of the masses or were considered to be deviations from the standard even by those who adhered to them. These two models have now also gained the right to exist in the awareness of the masses.

Elaborating on the subject of the work epic, R.Ya. Yevzerov noted that dissatisfaction with capitalist labor is combined in a conflicting and complex manner with a growing desire for self-development and self-fulfillment on the part of the individual. Certain categories of workers find satisfaction in their work due to the fact that it involves a higher level of intelligence, creativity and so forth. Even where this is not the case, however, working at a capitalist enterprise provides a better opportunity for self-realization and self-development than does being limited to the household environment. The desire for self-fulfillment and self-development cannot be taken as unconditionally positive, however. In the capitalist reality it combines extremely diverse and contradictory trends in the development of the individual, including extremely individualistic and egocentric attempts not to refuse oneself anything, simply for the sake of satisfying one's desires. Furthermore, it should be borne in mind that the urge for self-fulfillment is ordinarily linked to a desire to have and preserve a relatively high level of material security. In various kinds of non-Marxist and anti-Marxist studies the social nature of the individual and of mankind is frequently obscured or eclipsed by problems of self-realization. The exercising of the individual's human qualities cannot be considered in isolation from man's social nature. Under capitalism the conflicts between the self-fulfilling individual and other people and the society, which are inseparable from its antagonistic essence and organization, undermine and distort the process of the individual's self-development. Real progress for mankind is impossible without the balanced development of the individual and the society, of the individual in his connections and interrelations with the society. This is also the basis for the Marxist statement that mankind's progress should be realized with a highly humane focus so that "the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class contrasts, is replaced by an association in which the free development of each is a condition for the free development of all."^{*}

A number of talks dealt with problems of the anticrisis strategy of the governing class in the contemporary situation. G.G. Pirogov, for example, analyzed the main directions of the bourgeoisie's search for a way out of the crisis

^{*}K. Marx and F. Engels, "Zach." [Works], Vol. 4, p. 447.

situation, and specifically the problem of structural reorganization. At the present time it involves the replacement of individual sections of the system, while retaining the system's functioning as a whole. There are limited possibilities for structural reorganization along these lines, however. The optimal alternative from the standpoint of the bourgeoisie's class interests--shifting the cost of the structural reorganization to the workers and making its implementation subject to the elemental market forces--may prove unfeasible due to its social and economic consequences. Specific national data were used to show how capital is extensively introducing the achievements of scientific and technological progress in the course of the economic reorganization (various forms of non-labor-intensive but science-intensive production), with the emphasis on strict conservation and the dictates of "economic need."

Certain aspects of this problem as applicable to the USA were discussed in the talk by Candidate of Philosophical Sciences L.Ya. Mashezerskaya, who pointed out that Reaganomics in their purest form were an approval of the bourgeois-conservative response to the crisis. "R. Reagan's neoconservative revolution" was based on the demarcation of the ruling class and doctrines of a society of universal prosperity. They were also a sort of victory over the liberal-statist (etatistskaya) conception in the spirit of F. Roosevelt's New Deal. Reagan's line contained a radical reorientation of the state course toward a curtailment of the state's political consensus with the workers' movement. The American society's shift to positions of reactionary individualism by itself, however, did not indicate a total break with the realities of GMR [state monopolistic capital] by the institutions of power. L.Ya. Mashezerskaya and other participants in the discussion talked about two aspects of state monopolistic regulation which were particularly subjected to reform: social programs and collective bargaining processes.

G.G. Pirogov links the curtailment of state and semi-state social programs to an attempt by the capitalists to achieve not only the massive liquidation of equipment in the structurally depressed branches, but jobs as well, within the framework of the policy of mobilizing the capacity for the structural reorganization and without assuming responsibility for those deprived of work. They also want to finance the structural reorganization (at least in part) by means of the system of "social buffers." A study of the situation in the USA, Candidate of Historical Sciences I.M. Bunin noted, shows that the main detriment of the social programs is not the "financial losses" but the fact that they "suppress the motivation to work and to strive for innovation." The conservatives, specifically M. Friedman and R. Friedman, are convinced of this. Even when the monetarist policy can be effective for resolving short-term problems, it takes the economy to an impasse over the long run. L.Ya. Mashezerskaya noted that by intensifying those aspects of the work of his predecessors directed toward the more intensive use of state monopolistic methods against the working class, Reagan has created the most favorable conditions for the entrepreneurs in the labor market. It has been precisely in this spirit that collective agreements of recent years, under pressure from the ruling forces, have been transformed into a source of additional capital investment, using the funds saved out of wages. These collective agreements formerly promoted the use of a part of the profits to meet the needs of the workers.

The speakers noted that an offensive by conservative forces is apparent in a large number of nations, with certain modifications and combined with the creation of great, uncontrolled executive power and the limitation of political rights and freedoms. In every case it is a matter of the bourgeoisie taking revenge for what the workers' movement has gained in past years. L.Ya. Mashezerskaya noted that a massive attack on the trade unions is an element of that strategy. The industrialists are blackmailing the workers with the prospect of an increase in unemployment and forcing the labor unions to agree to a drastic deterioration of hiring terms. Yu.P. Nador demonstrated, as an example, that the taking of a path of open discrimination against the labor unions and undermining of their influence by the British Tories has created fear in certain trade union leaders that the battering ram of unemployment is capable of destroying the organized workers' movement.

I.S. Yazhborovskaya pointed out that along with the frontal attack on the material situation of the working class and an attempt to undermine the social and economic achievements of the previous decade, the ruling class is attempting to force the evolution of bourgeois parliamentarianism's political structures to the right and to transform the liberal democratic political systems into conservative liberal systems. In an attempt to strengthen their dominant position the conservative forces are stepping up the political pressure on the broad masses of the population to the extent that there is a real danger of an autocratic degeneration of the bourgeois parliamentary system.

As Candidate of Historical Sciences V.B. Kuvaldin stressed, however, the historical experience of both the masses and a certain part of the dominant class is preventing the bourgeoisie from resorting to the establishment of dictatorial regimes. Furthermore, modern capitalism is a far more integral system, interconnected and interacting, than was the case in the '30s. Among the factors preventing development from moving toward authoritarianism I.S. Yazhborovskaya also includes the adequately high level of politicalization of broad strata of the population, whereby the masses now possess political standards and values. With traditional participation by the majority of citizens in political life the autocratic degeneration of bourgeois parliamentary democracy requires first of all changes in the course which would assure the shifting of the politically active part of the population into the mainstream of a policy which would guarantee the stable functioning of the capitalist system by means of more flexible, all-embracing methods of subordinating the masses.

Various trends in the workers' movement are developing their own alternate plans for getting out of the crisis as a counterbalance to these strategic anticrisis tendencies of the ruling class. With respect to the matter of economic reorganization which would take into account not only economic motives, but also the social demands of the masses, K.G. Kholodkovskiy referred to historical experience in overcoming crises and stressed the need to create the proper political prerequisites. Specifically, a breach in the political area was the prime stimulus in Roosevelt's New Deal, and politics came before economics. That course, at first the exception, became the general rule as a result of political disintegration, which demonstrated fascism's dead-end nature in both the economic and particularly the socioeconomic respect.

An alliance of "antisystem" forces and reformists played a large role in the development of capital's postwar strategy and tactics. The reformist forces themselves were powerless without this alliance. Only later, when the mechanism was in a state of neglect, did the base come into being for the continuation of a reformist policy, at which time the "antisystem" forces retreated into the background. It is exactly the same today: The alternative to Reaganomics may appear to run counter to the needs of the economy, and only the bloc of reformists and "antisystem" forces can give it viability. In the absence of such a bloc Reaganomics will most likely be the only practical way out of the crisis under capitalism.

Pointing out the theoretical possibility of a social and economic reorganization which takes the interests of the workers into account, K.G. Kholodkovskiy stressed the fact that it would have to involve a huge increase in labor productivity, which could build up a base not only for supporting the unemployed masses, but also for more radical undertakings--redistribution of the remaining jobs, that is, a drastic reduction in the workday without a reduction in wages, satisfaction of the increased public needs and the creation of new jobs for this purpose. Candidate of History I.B. Levin, for example, believes that we can speak of a clearly defined shift of the focal point in the struggle for hegemony in the society to the reorganization of production structures and the social consequences of this reorganization. This set of problems has become the object of fierce class antagonism. In Italy, for example, due to the specific nature of the social and political situation in that nation, it can be seen more clearly than anywhere else that the process of accelerated differentiation of hired labor is a class oriented and class directed process. In order to hold the positions they have won, the workers' parties and trade unions must resort to a struggle to establish control over the reconstruction processes.

An attempt by British workers to understand the functioning of the economic mechanism both at the enterprise level and at the level of the national economy as a whole has been a characteristic of their struggle in recent years, Yu.P. Mador pointed out. Class political sophistication and scientific and technological literacy are frequently not enough to make it possible for the workers to completely understand the situation and take consistent action. This creates a large task for the organized workers' movement--to strive to enhance political, technological and general sophistication, along with struggling for jobs and for the preservation of the standard of living achieved. In a number of nations--in Scandinavia, among other places--the trade unions have now accumulated a certain body of experience in this kind of educational work, particularly that having to do with adoption of new technology. This work is frequently developed simultaneously with the development of alternative, antimperialistic programs.

Although there are conflicting ideas about the nature of this "alternative" alternative in the workers' movement as G.C. Diligenskiy stressed, it is perfectly capable of offering resistance to the firings, the lowering of real wages and other such developments--that is, thoroughly restricting capital's freedom in all matters of social and economic and political life, and this "partial" alternative has the support of the masses.

It is noteworthy that the trade union associations of a number of nations have been moving beyond the bounds of purely trade union work in recent years, and this is embittering the ruling circles. It includes antiwar demonstrations by the trade unions and the development of various kinds of medium-range and long-range plans for developing the economy. Specifically, Yu.P. Mador pointed out that Great Britain's National Mine Workers Union (NMWU) has worked out recommendations relative to the nation's long-term energy situation. The NMWU objects to the closing of mines not just because of the loss of jobs, but also for the sake of the nation's economic future.

Alternative anticrisis programs are also being worked out by the socialists, social democratic and labor parties both in power and in the opposition.

At first, I.M. Bunin pointed out, France's leftist government provided a more or less completed model of a policy offering an alternative to the course of the conservatives. Its short-term policy was based on the Keynesian theory of demand as a regulator of economic growth. In reality, it proved impossible to conduct an independent national policy running counter to the main trends in the world economy. A growing interdependence in the economies of the western nations is producing a trend of unification of methods of day-to-day regulation, particularly in the area of anti-inflation policy. The leftist government's long-term strategy is based on dirigisme, which is the centralized establishment of proportions for the reproduction of public capital, using direct and indirect methods of influencing production, including even the nationalization of private property. There is no unified view on the structural reorganization of the economy within the government, and although it cannot be said that all opportunities have been lost, hopes for a structural reorganization of the French economy by means of dirigistic [economic planning and control by the state] measures are becoming increasingly faint.

The course taken by F. Gonzalez's government in Spain, Candidate of Historical Sciences S.M. Khenkin noted, is based on reformist trends in the mass awareness of the workers and does not call for radical social reforms affecting the foundations of the existing system. The government is conducting a policy of "small-scale reforms" designed to gradually expand the areas of its influence and control within the existing structures. The policy of strict conservation and of compromising with the bourgeoisie is not producing the anticipated results in the area of employment. The nationalization of Rumas, a huge private concern on the verge of bankruptcy, which was undertaken at the beginning of 1983, was announced as an "emergency measure," and the government promised that the concern would be denationalized in the future. While pursuing a cautious course in the social and economic area, the government still managed to reduce inflation, introduce the 40-hour workweek, ban the combining of jobs, and so forth.

An anticrisis alternative to the policy of the conservatives is being developed among the social democrats in the opposition. Yu.P. Mador noted that Labor Party members in Great Britain, as an example, are attempting to formulate a program of action to create a mixed economy, which would be realized not only by the entrepreneurs and the state, but also the trade unions. The idea of creating a National Development Agency on the basis of a trilateral partnership

(the state, business and the trade unions) is being advanced, and a number of measures are being proposed for the development of an "economic democracy" at the enterprises, as well as participation by the trade unions in the exercising of control over the government's economic measures. Special attention is being given to the creation of new jobs and the provision of job training for the workers.

Candidate of Historical Sciences A.-V. Karlsen noted that at the end of the '70s the social democrats in Denmark had based their course for overcoming crisis developments on a combination of a rigid "revenue policy" and the adoption of an "economic democracy" in the form of worker participation in the division of enterprise profits. In the situation of parliament's instability, however, it had to totally abandon the second part. It joined the opposition in 1982 without having formulated the new, anticrisis concept. Denmark's leftist forces, particularly the communists, are devoting a great deal of attention to the development of an alternative economic program. They proceed from the premise that the depth of the economic crisis of the '80s makes it necessary not simply to achieve a growth of domestic demand (in their assessment, this was achieved at the end of the '70s) and to restore the social gains of the workers, but also to fundamentally reorganize the nation's economic structure. Since the private sector has been unable to provide stable development of the economy, it is necessary to create a state industrial sector in the nation, which could contribute to the resolution of the employment problem, the satisfaction of domestic demand and the financing of imports of industrial raw materials. The implementation of the comprehensive structural reorganization program is to be accompanied by an enlargement of the democratic rights of enterprise workers.

Solutions to capitalism's crisis proposed by left-wing radical forces contain a qualitatively different approach. Candidate of Historical Sciences S.G. Ayvazova demonstrated in an analysis of the concept of French left-wing radical theoretician A. Gorz that his proposals are based on the philosophical tradition of irrational and romantic (antitechnicism). According to the views of A. Gorz capitalism's current crisis is a crisis of the industrial mode of production, which is oriented toward a continuous growth of productive forces. In the situation of the current technological reorganization hired labor ceases to be the determining principle of public life. In his opinion, "the total development of productive forces has already been completed," and the main task is therefore not one of expanding production, but of organizing the economy in a fundamentally different way. Pointing out that society stands on the threshold of communism, A. Gorz proposes a finely developed "dualistic model" of transition to a society of social justice which establishes a new type of collective practices and various types of social experiments for establishing the "new way of life."

In I.B. Levin's assessment the restoration of working class unity (demonstrated so forcefully in the memorable strike battles of the end of the '60s and the first half of the '70s, for example), that is, the reunification of the central nucleus of the working class with "white-collar" workers and the new marginal strata in the struggle is an absolute condition of the working class's struggle for its hegemony in the society. The fact that all of these forces take a different approach to the role of labor in life and in the development of the importance of participating in social and political activities makes this a

difficult task. It demands, among other things, not merely active, but flexible and bold, participation by the workers' parties and trade unions in the formation processes and for the new, marginal strata to acquire their own "collective cast."

In general, it is apparent that a determined and consistent struggle to expand the influence of the masses upon the shaping of the political course and to democratize the political system can be in the vital interests of all workers at the contemporary stage. In the search for a strategy for reorganizing the economy, V.B. Kuvaldin noted, it is essential to constantly consider the ratio of class forces in the society. The working class needs an objective analysis of the situation, the ability to distinguish between developmental imperatives and the bourgeoisie's class interests and to soberly assess the enemy's strong and weak points, and the ability to concentrate the efforts on the most important directions of the class struggle and to protect its own basic gains. In other words, the working class must struggle for a democratic way out of the crisis, which gives maximum consideration to the interests of the workers.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1984

11499

CSO: 1807/300

INTERNATIONAL

INTERNATIONAL TRADE UNION CONFERENCE ON ANTIWAR MOVEMENT

Moscow RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNNY MIR in Russian No 4, Jul-Aug 84 (signed to press 13 Jul 84) pp 157-161

[Report by B.G. Stolpovskiy "Time to Act--for Peace, for Social Progress"]

[Excerpts] It is an especially important task today to make those forces retreat, to achieve a turnaround from confrontation to detente and cooperation and to move decisively and consistently toward a drastic reduction in armaments, particularly nuclear weapons, based on strict observance of the principle of equality and identical security, toward the creation of a climate of trust among states. The antiwar movement, in which the working class and the workers, their political parties and public organizations are in the vanguard, is expected to play an important role in the achievement of this turnaround. The trade unions, which are engaging more and more actively in the struggle for peace, disarmament and cooperation, have a prominent place in the antiwar stream.

What is their contemporary role in this movement? What kind of experience do they have in taking part in it? What are the specific forms and methods of the antiwar activities? What can and should be done to stimulate their activity in the movement and to involve new strata of working masses in the struggle against that main danger--the threat of a thermonuclear catastrophe? These and a number of other vitally important questions were discussed at the International Conference on "Trade Unions in the Struggle for the Vital Interests of the Workers and Against the Danger of a New War," held in Moscow in May of this year. Representatives of Soviet trade unions, 130 delegations from trade unions in 111 nations on all continents, Soviet and foreign scholars took part in it. The organizers of the conference and its participants included the International Workers' Movement Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, the Higher Trade Union Movement School of the AUCCTU and other scientific centers.

The conference was opened by V.I. Prokhorov, deputy chairman of the AUCCTU. A.M. Subbotin, AUCCTU secretary, presented a report on "The Workers and Trade Unions in the Struggle for Peace and Social Progress," which provided a well-based analysis of the role and the capabilities of the international trade union movement in the resolution of problems facing the workers and their trade unions, particularly the burning and urgent problem of preventing a world thermonuclear catastrophe.

This analysis underwent specific development in two other reports at the plenary meeting. One of them, "Trade Unions of the Capitalist Nations in the Antiwar Movement," was presented by James Milne, general secretary of the Scottish Congress of Trade Unions and chairman of the International Trade Union Committee for Peace and Disarmament (Dublin), the second, "The Struggle for Peace and Disarmament as the Most Important Prerequisite for Social and Economic Progress in the Developing Nations," by Chaturanan Mishtra, chairman of the Indian Congress of Trade Unions.

Discussion of the reports was further developed in the discussion of problems in the sections, which were headed by representatives of trade unions and the scientific community. For example, the work of the first section, which was "Capitalism's Crisis, the Arms Race and the Situation of the Workers," was directed on an equal basis by Doctor of Economic Sciences G.Ye. Skorov, deputy director of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Carlos Corvalho, member of the National Secretariat of the General Conference of Portuguese Workers-National (indersindikal) (GCPW-NI); the second section, "The Antiwar Movement and the Trade Unions" by Doctor of Economic Sciences A.I. Bel'chuk, deputy director of the International Workers' Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Professor Herbert Steiner of Austria, president of the European Associations of Centers for the Study of the Workers' Movement; and the third section, "International Solidarity of the Workers in the Struggle Against Imperialism," by Doctor of Jurisprudence M.V. Baglay, pro-vice-chancellor of the Higher Trade Union School, and Emmanuil Afrani, assistant general secretary of the Organization of African Trade Union Unity.

As representatives of England, Australia, the USA, Israel and the USSR convincingly demonstrated in their reports in the first session, the arms race is becoming an increasingly perceptible drag on economic growth, which is an essential condition for improving the situation of the workers. The myth of the economic benefit from military outlays was convincingly dispelled. They have only intensified the crisis processes in the capitalist economy and resulted in the curtailment of many social programs, which has struck those groups of the population least well-off. A total of 250 such programs have fallen victim to the arms race in the USA alone. During the years of the Reagan Presidency the number of people living below the poverty level has grown to 15 percent of the entire population. The number of impoverished people in Great Britain has doubled to 4 million since M. Thatcher's government has been in power. Poverty has grown markedly in the FRG, where around 4 million citizens live on the brink of poverty, and in other industrially developed capitalist nations.

Militarization of the economy, the participants at the forum attested, is seriously complicated the employment problem in those nations. While they had 5 million unemployed at the beginning of the '60s, and the figure had grown to 9-10 million at the beginning of the '70s, the number exceeded 30 million at the beginning of the '80s. From 7 to 17 percent of all the able-bodied people in the developed capitalist nations and around 55 percent of those in the developing nations have now lost their jobs.

Growing military expenditures are one of the important causes of this development. Investments in military production create 2/3 to 1/2 fewer jobs than the same

investments in the civilian area. According to data compiled by American researchers and presented at the conference, for example, transferring funds from the military area to education, public health and environmental protection in 1980 would have made it possible not only to provide jobs for 5 million of those employed in U.S. military production, but also to create an additional 6.7 million jobs.

Because of this a number of talks underscored the importance of stepping up the trade unions' struggle to convert the inflated military industry and reduce military outlays. This is one of the effective ways of stabilizing the economy not only for nations with a high degree of militarization of the economy, such as the USA, Great Britain and the FRG, but also for nations such as Portugal. NATO's involvement of the latter in the arms race, as the representative of the GCPW-NI pointed out, has led to a drastic deterioration in the living conditions of Portuguese workers. Unemployment has reached 12 percent in that nation, and inflation and foreign indebtedness are growing.

The conference demonstrated the fact that the conversion of military industry is not only important, but is also realistically feasible. It would have positive economic consequences conforming to the interests of the workers in both nations with a planned economy and nations with a market economy. The difficulties involved in such a conversion are highly exaggerated by those interested in continuing the arms race. They can be overcome and would be repaid with interest by the economic and political effects from halting the arms race. The Dublin committee is performing a great deal of work on the study of this problem. In December of 1983 it formed a special working group to coordinate the research work performed by the trade unions of various nations on the questions of conversion and disarmament. Preparations were begun for an extensive study with the participation of trade union centers and scientific research institutions, including the International Workers' Movement Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, in accordance with a resolution adopted in 1981 by the General Confederation of the International Labor Organization, "On the Economic and Social Effects of Disarmament."

These and other main directions in the antiwar activities of the trade unions, new developments, forms and methods, and problems of shaping the antiwar consciousness of the masses, and their involvement in the struggle for peace were the focus of attention at meetings of the second section. Just the interest evoked in its participants by the introductory report presented by Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences T.T. Timofeyev, director of the International Workers' Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and section co-chairman A.I. Bel'chuk was significant.

Despite the different political orientations of the trade unions and the diversity of the conditions under which they are struggling, the forum's participants were unanimous both in their assessment of the negative consequences of the arms race and in their conclusions on the need to increase the scale of the antiwar actions. K.G. Shrivastava, secretary of the World Federation of Trade Unions, pointed out the global nature of the threat created by the deployment of Pershing 2 and cruise missiles. The WFTU therefore considers the halting of the deployment and the removal of these types of nuclear weapons from Western Europe is a priority task of workers and trade unions of the entire world.

The problems covered in the discussion can be broken down into a number of groups. Primarily, these are the increased responsibility of mass workers' organizations, which are expected to be the vanguard in the struggle, new developments and trends, and the specific contribution of each group in the trade union movement to the cause of strengthening peace. This was stated, among others, by Professor H. Steiner (Austria), M. Gulakov, deputy director of the Institute of Philosophy and Sociological Research of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences (Czechoslovakia), and G. Bolaffi, member of the directing committee of the General Confederation of Labor of Italy (Vikt). "We now need," the representative of Italy's trade union movement stated, "the maximum degree of activeness on the part of all public forces, including--and perhaps, particularly--the trade unions, in order to deactivate the machinery of war which is already been put into motion." Time is of the essence, he stressed, because the Pershing 2 and cruise missiles have already been placed in a state of operational readiness at bases in the FRG and Great Britain, and are being put into the same state of readiness at Comiso on Italian soil.

The demands of the trade unions are not limited to the slogan "Remove the missiles from Europe!". They apply to the entire spectrum of the arms race. The talks by representatives of the USA, the FRG, Italy, Norway, India, Columbia and many other nations contained extensive factual and analytical information on advances of the antiwar movement, on its scope and its problems. Italy's trade unions, particularly the General Confederation of Labor, have set the task "of enlarging initiatives and bringing them into conformity with the demands of the day, particularly in matters of vital importance to the cause of peace and disarmament--mainly, matters pertaining to the Euromissiles." W. Rossman (FRG), chairman of the Marxist Research Institute, pointed out that the movement to create initiative groups for the defense of peace at enterprises is an important feature of the antiwar work. These groups, which have come into being at more than 300 enterprises, arrange for the workers to take part in meetings and demonstrations, organize the collection of signatures, conduct discussions and explanatory work, issue newspapers and work out plans for converting military industry to peace production. In that nation and in other nations where the missiles are being deployed or where their deployment is planned, the trade unions take part in mass processions, the blocking of American bases and the holding of antimissile referendums.

The North American trade unions are becoming involved more and more extensively in the antiwar movement. Around 20 branch labor unions of the USA advocate a freeze on nuclear weapons. They include labor unions of auto workers, garment makers and textile workers, electricians, and dock workers. Paul (Karokha), head of delegation from the National Center for Trade Union Action and Democracy and chairman of a division of the United Steel Workers Union, reported that a coalition made up of a large number of branch labor unions has severely criticized U.S. intervention in Salvador and other Central American nations. The Canadian Workers Congress is conducting an extensive campaign in defense of peace. R. (Fortin), representative of the Federation of Metal Workers of Quebec, told how the nation's labor unions submitted a petition to parliament demanding that testing cruise missiles in the nation be prevented, that Canada be declared a zone free of nuclear weapons and that military outlays be reduced and the freed funds used for social and economic needs.

Workers and trade unions are now taking action more and more frequently with a two-part slogan: "Allocations for the Creation of Jobs, and not Nuclear Missiles!". This is confirmed by the presently increasing wave of strikes and demonstrations by such groups of workers as the British miners, French, Belgian and Spanish metallurgists, whose jobs are endangered as a result of the structural crisis and the increase in military outlays. An awareness of the connection between the arms race and crisis developments in the economy prompted the Association of German Trade Unions (AGTU) to resort to a strike in the antiwar struggle. For the same reason (Ya. Papamikhail), deputy chairman of the General Confederation of Labor of Greece, noted at the conference, the largest trade union center in the nation conducted a 10-minute strike in support of a Greek initiative to delay the deployment of missiles for 6 months in the interest of continuing the Geneva talks, which was rejected by the USA and the NATO leaders.

A considerable part of the discussion was taken up with the subjects of the connection between the antiwar struggle and the economic development of the liberated nations, and the role of the trade unions of those nations in the peace movement. Representatives of trade unions in India, Madagascar, Tanzania, Nigeria and the Congo dealt mainly with the fact that the arms race into which the imperialists are drawing the liberated states is preventing the accomplishment of development tasks and the establishment of a new international economic order on a democratic, anti-imperialist basis. Due to a lack of financial resources 40 percent of the planet's population is without medical aid, and 500 million people are illiterate. The liberated states and the workers and trade unions of those nations are increasingly clearly understanding the incompatibility of their basic interests with the militaristic, aggressive course of the USA and its allies, a fact confirmed at the 7th Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Nonaligned Nations, held in Delhi in 1983.

Questions of how the trade unions could make the most effective contribution to the antiwar struggle were also thoroughly discussed. They included the issues of cooperation and unity of action among the trade unions, regardless of differences in political views and international affiliation. It was the unanimous opinion that they need to make a determined effort to establish contacts, to step up the dialog, to develop solidarity and strive for joint actions--combined or parallel. In the final analysis the effectiveness of the entire antiwar movement, which is increasingly assuming the nature of social protest, depends to a significant degree upon the solidarity of the forces forming its mass base and upon the unity of the various groups of the international workers' and trade union movement. Political, religious and ideological differences must not prevent unity of action by the trade unions. This was the position taken by most of those speaking both in the section "The Antiwar Movement and the Trade Unions" and the other sections at the conference.

This position was affirmed and developed in meetings of the third section. Presentations by trade union officials and social scientists from Sri Lanka, Cyprus, Vietnam, Angola, Senegal and other nations revealed an extensive picture of crimes by imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism and the transnational corporations against the liberated nations. Those forces bear responsibility for the outbreak of 146 wars and armed conflicts between 1945 and 1982, most of which occurred on the territory of "third world" nations. They are now drawing those nations into their global strategy, stepping up their plunder of natural resources and their exploitation of the cheap labor force, using the territories of those states as staging areas for expansion, and imposing a policy of increasing military outlays upon them.

It was noted at the conference that their portion of weapons purchases in the overall balance of the world weapons trade has grown sharply--to 70 percent--as a result of their involvement in the arms race. The portion of general world military outlays accounted for by those nations increased from 4.5 percent in 1960 to 19 percent at the beginning of the '80s, an increase of more than 4-fold. And this is at a time when the effects of capitalism's economic crises are felt especially severely precisely by the developing nations. It was stated with complete justification that combatting the effects of those crises means, first of all, struggling to keep the liberated nations from being drawn into the arms race. This is all the more true, since their struggle for development, for a new international economic order, has been complicated by the intrusion of the predatory transnational corporations into their economies, by an enormous foreign indebtedness exceeding 800 billion dollars, and frequently by the unavoidable need to spend considerable resources and funds to repel armed forays by imperialism and its mercenaries.

The conference participants condemned American imperialism's aggressive acts against Nicaragua and other Latin American nations and its support of Israel's aggression against the Arab peoples, and spoke out for the elimination of the apartheid regime in South Africa and for turning the Indian Ocean and Pacific basins into peace zones. They proclaimed their solidarity with the struggling peoples.

In the plenary sessions and during the discussion in the sections the speakers gave a great deal of attention to constructive peace initiatives put forth by the Soviet Union and other socialist nations. They noted the great importance of the USSR's proposal on reaching agreement on specific standards which would govern relations among states possessing nuclear weapons, and on making those standards mandatory. This would help to prevent a nuclear catastrophe and contribute to a shift away from confrontation to detente and cooperation.

One of the useful conclusions drawn by the conference participants, specifically the representatives from Austria, Czechoslovakia and Vietnam, is that life urgently demands a further strengthening of the alliance of the workers' and trade union movement and science in the interest of stimulating the antiwar activities of the trade unions. It is essential to make a more thorough and systematic study of new processes, tasks, forms and methods in the struggle waged by the trade unions for peace and social progress. A considerable amount of work is being performed in this direction by the International Labor Union Committee for Peace and Disarmament (Dublin), and in the USSR by the Commission on Social Questions of the Committee for European Security, the Scientific Council for the Study of Peace and Disarmament Problems of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and its section for the study of social aspects of the antiwar movements.

The International Conference on "Trade Unions in the Struggle for the Vital Interests of the Workers and Against the Threat of a New War" demonstrated that despite all their differences the trade unions advocate peace, peaceful coexistence and cooperation among states with different social systems, and are against the exacerbation of tensions and the arms race. The constructive exchange of opinions which occurred at this trade union forum permits us to make the following conclusions about the new phase in the antiwar activities of workers and trade unions, which started at the beginning of 1984.

In the first place, substantial shifts have occurred in the attitudes of the working masses as a result of the increased danger of war brought about by the ruling circles of the USA and NATO. This gives the trade unions a real opportunity to step up their actions to have the Pershing II and cruise missiles removed from Western Europe and for a halting of the arms race.

In the second place, there is an increasing interrelation between the antiwar movement and the struggle waged by the workers for their social and economic demands, which is resulting in the expansion and intensification of the antiwar activeness of the working class and the trade unions, regardless of differences in their political views and international affiliation.

Finally, in the third place, there are markedly increasing, objective possibilities for contacts and the development of dialog, cooperation and unity of action among trade unions of different trends and for expanding the coalition of forces working to prevent a thermonuclear war.

We should not exaggerate the successes achieved, however, just as we should not underestimate them. An enormous amount of work lies ahead with respect to mobilizing all the currents of the international trade union movement in the interest of peace and social progress. There is no way to achieve the goal today other than by jointly struggling against the arms race. It is the arms race, after all, which is paving the way to war. To unite and take action--this is the most important thing defining the mission of the international trade union movement at the contemporary stage in the struggle for peace.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1984

11499

CSO: 1807/300

INTERNATIONAL

INSTITUTE BOOK ON ADVERSE EFFECTS OF NEW TECHNOLOGY IN WEST

Moscow RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNYI MIR in Russian No 4, Jul-Aug 84 (signed to press 13 Jul 84) pp 175-177

[Review by R.M. Entov of book "Tekhnologicheskiye sdvigi, nayemnyy trud i rabocheye dvizheniye razvitykh kapitalisticheskikh stran: Novyye tendentsii v sfere zanyatosti" [Technological Advances, Hired Labor and the Worker's Movement of the Developed Capitalist Nations: New Trends in the Sphere of Employment]; A.A. Galkin, editor-in-chief, Nauka, Moscow, 1983, 368 pages]

[Text] A new book by a group of authors headed by Professor A.A. Galkin, published by the International Workers' Movement Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, is devoted to one of the most acute problems occurring in the course of modern capitalism's social and economic development--the effect of scientific and technical progress upon employment dynamics. The nature of the problem can be viewed in two ways. In the first place, the effect of scientific and technical progress upon employment can be regarded simply as a real fact and in this sense, as a source of unprecedented, real economic and social and in the final analysis, political, conflicts and problems; and in the second place, one can consider the scientific and theoretical nature of the problem: The study of the phenomenon presents considerable difficulty, as does the development of unequivocal interpretations and assessments.

A trend of more or less steady growth of unemployment became clearly defined in most of the capitalist nations after World War II. Characteristically, official documents in the USA at the beginning of the '60s set the "acceptable" ("natural," according to the interpretation of the problem by conservative economists of that time) unemployment level at 3 percent of the workforce, for example, whereas by the end of the decade the L. Johnson Administration proclaimed that "full employment" coincides with an unemployment level of 4.5 percent. By the end of President J. Carter's stay in power "full employment" was taken to mean a situation in which no more than 6 percent of the workforce is unemployed. When the American economy entered the phase of cyclical improvement following the crisis of 1980-1982, this was accompanied by "unabsorbed" unemployment exceeding 8 percent of the workforce for the first time since the war.

Events of the past decade have been the most dramatic. The slowed rates of economic growth, the increased duration and intensity of the cyclical crises, structural crises--all of this had to affect the processes of employment dynamics. Since the beginning of the '70s the number of employees in industry, the

leading field of material production, has remained at practically the same level in the USA, Japan and Italy, and there has been a gradual decline in the number in England, France and the FRG. While an increase in the amount of labor used in the other sectors of the economy, primarily the tertiary sphere, has made it possible to increase the total numbers of the employed in the USA and Japan, in a number of Western European nations the combined demand on the labor market has demonstrated a tendency to stagnate. It has even dropped markedly in some of them--the FRG, for example. A reduction in the total number of the employed over a fairly long period of time is a new and important feature of capitalism's postwar development.

The book reviewed here represents one of the first attempts at a monographic study of the new trends in employment dynamics. In their analysis of the main factors determining employment dynamics throughout the '70s and at the beginning of the '80s, the authors single out the effect of certain of the latest technological advances (the adoption of automatic lines controlled by means of electronic computers, for example, and the conversion to flexible production programs controlled from a single electronic computer center), which have resulted in a reduction in the amount of live labor used. Mechanical manipulators equipped with fairly complex regulating devices are being used more and more extensively in the industry of the developed capitalist nations. The spread of industrial robots is resulting not only from the gradual perfection of their design, but also from a relative reduction in their cost. According to estimates cited in the book, for example, robots used in the assembly shops of an Italian automotive plant were paying for themselves within approximately 18 months by the end of the '70s (pp 211-212).

The adoption of electronic automatic systems requires additional servicing personnel (highly skilled personnel, as a rule). This increase in the demand for workers is far smaller than the number of workers forced out of production, however--those who previously performed the same operations "by hand." In the assembly shops of an automotive plant in France, for example, each new job for a highly skilled specialist eliminated approximately 12 jobs requiring a lower skills level (p 149).

One of the most characteristic features of modern scientific and technological progress is the extensive introduction of objects of labor with preset qualities. Plastics, fiberglass and other types of synthetic products are being used more and more frequently as construction materials. By the beginning of the '80s every automobile produced in the USA contained an average of up to 86 kilograms of plastic parts. The area of application of these materials has recently been increasing especially rapidly (p 60). The amount of labor required to produce parts of synthetic materials is 1/3 to 1/8 less than for metal parts, in addition to which the use of the former is making it possible to convert to the construction of complex panels by means of forging and stamping technology. Typically, the slowdown in the growth of employment, followed by a reduction of the workforce, in the metallurgical industry of many capitalist nations was actually not accompanied by a significant increase in the demand for workers in the chemical industry and other branches producing the synthetic materials.

The book contains a vast amount of material showing that the reequipment of production on the basis of modern technology inevitably produces a significant

reduction in the demand for workers with lower and middle skills and forces out of the production process primarily those workers performing intermediate operations. The structural reorganization of the economy, which is accompanied by the transfer of production operations to other geographic regions (or even to other nations and other continents in the case of the transnational corporations), brings an irreversible increase in the number of centers of unemployment in many of the old industrial centers.

Among the book's merits we should mention its thorough analysis of various structural disproportions--branch, regional and others--in the development of the capitalist economy, which are making the employment dynamics extremely nonuniform today. By the end of the '70s 250,000-300,000 people were passing through the labor exchange in Great Britain each month (pp 291-292). This meant that on the average every 6th worker lost his job in a year. A total of 159 applications were received for one white-collar vacancy in the province of Languedoc in France, but fewer than 16 in the Paris area (p 191). This nonuniform demand for workers indicates the existence of areas of large-scale unemployment and ever more frequently forcing blue- and white-collar workers to relocate.

Unemployment has hit the youth especially hard. An ever increasing part of the young men and women entering the labor market for the first time are encountering serious problems at the very start. Individuals between the ages of 16 and 24 years presently make up around half of all the unemployed in the USA and approximately 40 percent in France and England. Two thirds of the young Italians without regular earnings have been unable to find work after completing their education. Never before (at least since statistics on the age structure of the unemployed population have been published) have so many of the youth been without work. An ever increasing period of time goes by from the time the young men and women complete their education to the time they become directly involved in the production process. All of the facts convincingly demonstrate that the dominance of capitalist relations is dooming the contemporary society to extremely wasteful forms of training and use of the workforce.

Selecting the influence of modern forms of scientific and technical progress upon employment dynamics as the central problem for their study, the authors demonstrated that they had made an extremely fruitful choice. It permitted them to make numerous interesting observations and to present a number of theoretically important ideas. The book also contains certain interpretations which we consider to be disputable, however: The authors link all or almost all of the most important changes in employment directly to the latest technical advances in production. There is no doubt that these advances are exceptionally important and deserve very serious study. A more detailed analysis of the influence of other factors (particularly general economic factors) upon employment dynamics and the nature of contemporary unemployment should probably still have been added to the study, however. The most interesting and meaningful factors characterizing the general "background" against which the processes involved in the workers being forced out of public production developed are given in the first chapter. We would have liked the analysis provided in subsequent sections of employments in the individual capitalist states to be more closely linked with the specific features of economic development in those nations in the '70s and at the beginning of the '80s.

When we assess the effect of the most modern means of production automation upon employment, we cannot ignore the fact that only the first steps are being taken in the application of these technical innovations today (a fact correctly pointed out in the first chapter of the book--p 24, for example). The number of workers replaced by robots and the latest automatic lines controlled by electronic computers still accounts for a relatively small portion of all the workers, but it would be an inexcusable error, of course, not to see in these processes the threatening forerunners of future significant changes in the ratio of supply to demand for the workforce.

The laws of capitalism place limitations on the use of machines, however, as a result of which a large part of the workers are still performing heavy manual labor in the most highly developed bourgeois nations today. This is convincingly borne out by numerous facts cited in the book. It is enough to recall the findings of a study performed in Japan during the second half of the '70s: More than a quarter of all the workers, it was learned, are forced to manually lift and carry loads weighing 20-50 kilograms or even more in the course of performing their jobs (p 347).

The deterioration of conditions for capitalist production, extremely serious, has also limited possibilities for the highly productive new equipment and technology to affect the scale of overall employment during the past decade. This is eloquently demonstrated by changes in the dynamics of the indicators of the capital-labor ratio and labor productivity. We know that the crisis of 1973-1975 opened a new phase in capitalism's economic development, characterized in most of the capitalist nations by a significant slowdown in the growth of labor productivity. In the United States the longest drop in the absolute level of labor productivity since the war occurred at the beginning of the '80s, and rates of growth of the capital-labor ratio also slowed considerably. A drop in real wages caused by the accelerated rate of inflation and a prolonged crisis drop in production limited the relative drop in demand for workers to a certain degree. It is a noteworthy fact that negative changes were observed in labor productivity dynamics even in those branches which had begun modernization of the production processes and the intensive introduction of electronic automation means (electrical engineering and general machine building, the chemical industry and others, for example).

In the situation of slowed economic growth, the cutting of long-term investment programs and increased attempts by the entrepreneurs to reduce turnover periods for their capital, capitalist "rationalization" measures played an especially large role with respect to increasing unemployment. Many of those measures involved the closing of certain enterprises for an indefinite period (an extremely long period, as indicated by the experience of the past one and a half decades), as well as the organizational and technical reorganization of the production processes at existing enterprises, which drastically increased the load on those workers who managed to keep their jobs.

Naturally, we can also not fail to see the intermediary links which have developed in the contemporary situation between the conversion to the new organizational structures and the more extensive use of the latest technical means of production automation and control and the gathering and processing of current information. The two processes are organically interwoven. In the situation of

cyclical improvement and large-scale renewal of fixed capital the intermediary influence of the growth of capital's technical structure apparently moved to the fore, while the drop in total production volume and the effects of capitalist rationalization were the primary factors in the situation of crisis and depression.

A thorough study of the latest technological advances permitted the authors to single out important trends in the employment dynamics, which can apparently manifest themselves with special force in the next period. They have unquestionably drawn the correct conclusions to the effect that, in the first place, "the forcing of workers out of public production as a result of the technological reorganization will in all likelihood continue with increasing force..." (p 24) and in the second place, that "a relative drop in employment and in many cases, an absolute reduction, and the development of unemployment into an extremely important factor in the economic, social and political situation in the main industrially developed capitalist nations is moving to the fore the need for new ways of achieving effective solidarity between the workers and the unemployed" (p 30).

This makes it especially important to develop alternative programs of social and economic development to counter the strategy of monopolistic capital. The book describes the possible substance of such programs with great precision. Such programs would take into account primarily the need to shorten the work week, to increase paid leave, establish earlier pensions, and so forth. The working class has previously advocated many of these programs, but their role is increasing significantly within the general set of demands in the new situation, and their realization would definitely help to maintain the demand for workers. It is especially important, however, to combine them with another group of alternative programs, which include plans for the creation of new jobs. The working class's struggle against the militaristic course, particularly the aggressive plans of American imperialism, has an especially large role in this respect. Today, when the military preparations of R. Reagan's Administration are accompanied by a cut in state outlays for the organization of public jobs, health, education and environmental protection, the workers are developing an increasingly active struggle against militarism, which is swallowing up hundreds of thousands of jobs, while at the same time removing aid from the poorest segments of the population with the greatest need for it. The struggle for the implementation of alternative programs by its very nature requires that the economic and political demands of the working class be closely linked.

The new book is a serious and substantive study of an extremely urgent problem. It will undoubtedly be of great interest to many readers.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1984

11499

CSO: 1807/300

END